

Quantum Gravity from Noncommutative Spacetime

Jungjai Lee ^{a *} and Hyun Seok Yang ^{b †}

^a *Department of Physics, Daejin University, Pocheon 487-711, Korea*

^b *Institute for the Early Universe, Ewha Womans University, Seoul 120-750, Korea*

ABSTRACT

We review a novel and authentic way to quantize gravity. This noble clue is based on the fact that Einstein gravity can be formulated in terms of symplectic geometry rather than Riemannian geometry in the context of emergent gravity. An essential step for emergent gravity is to realize the equivalence principle, the most important property in the theory of gravity (general relativity), from $U(1)$ gauge theory on a symplectic or Poisson manifold. Through the realization of the equivalence principle which is an intrinsic property in the symplectic geometry known as the Darboux theorem or the Moser lemma, one can understand how diffeomorphism symmetry arises from noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory and so gravity can emerge from the noncommutative electromagnetism, which is also an interacting theory. As a consequence, it is feasible to formulate a background independent quantum gravity where the prior existence of any spacetime structure is not *a priori* assumed but defined by fundamental ingredients in quantum gravity theory. This scheme for quantum gravity resolves many notorious problems in theoretical physics, for example, to resolve the cosmological constant problem, to understand the nature of dark energy and to explain why gravity is so weak compared to other forces. In particular, it leads to a remarkable picture for what matter is. A matter field such as leptons and quarks simply arises as a stable localized geometry, which is a topological object in the defining algebra (noncommutative \star -algebra) of quantum gravity.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Nx, 02.40.Gh, 11.25.Tq

Keywords: Quantum Gravity, Emergent Gravity, Noncommutative Field Theory

September 1, 2010

*jjlee@daejin.ac.kr

†hsyang@ewha.ac.kr

1 Introduction

The most important property in the theory of gravity (general relativity) is arguably the equivalence principle. The equivalence principle says that gravity can be interpreted as an inertial force and so it is always possible to locally eliminate the gravitational force by a coordinate transformation, i.e., by a local inertial frame. It immediately leads to the remarkable picture that gravity has to describe a spacetime geometry rather than a force immanent in spacetime. The equivalence principle also implies that gravity is obviously a universal force such that gravity influences and is influenced by everything that carries an energy. Therefore the spacetime has to serve as a stage for everything supported on it as well as an actor for the dynamical evolution of the stage (spacetime) itself. In order to quantize gravity, we thus have to cook a frying pan and a fish altogether. How ?

1.1 What is quantum gravity ?

Quantum gravity means to “quantize” gravity. Gravity, according to Einstein’s general relativity, is the dynamics of spacetime geometry where spacetime is a Riemannian manifold and the gravitational field is represented by a Riemannian metric. So naively the quantum gravity is meant to quantize the Riemannian manifold. But we are still vague about how to “quantize” a Riemannian manifold.

Quantum mechanics has constituted a prominent example of “quantization” about for a century since its foundation. But the quantization in this case is controlled by the Planck constant \hbar whose physical dimension is length times momentum, i.e., $(x \times p)$. Therefore the quantization in terms of \hbar is to quantize (or to deform in a weak sense) a *particle* phase space, as we know very well. Because we consider a classical field $\phi(x) \in C^\infty(M)$ as a smooth function defined on a spacetime M and a many-body system describing infinitely many particles distributed over the spacetime M , quantum field theory is also defined by the quantization in terms of \hbar in an infinite-dimensional particle phase space, as we clearly know.

Now consider to “quantize” gravity. With \hbar again ? Because gravity is characterized by its own intrinsic scale given by the Newton constant G where classical gravity corresponds to $G \rightarrow 0$ limit,¹ we should leave open the possibility that the quantum gravity is defined by a deformation in terms of G instead of \hbar . Customarily we have taken the same route to the quantization of gravity as the conventional quantum field theory. Thus the conventional quantum gravity also intends to quantize an infinite-dimensional *particle* phase space associated with the metric field $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$ (or its variants such as the Ashtekar variables or spin networks) of Riemannian geometry. But we have to carefully contemplate whether our routine approach for quantum gravity is on a right track or not, because gravity is very different from other forces such as the electromagnetic, weak and strong forces. For a

¹Nevertheless, gravitational phenomena are ubiquitous in our everyday life. The reason is that the gravitational force is only attractive and so always additive. As a result, the standard gravitational parameter GM for an astronomical body with mass M is not small. For example, $GM_e = 4 \times 10^{14} m^3/s^2$ for the Earth where $M_e = 5.96 \times 10^{24} kg$, which corresponds to $1cm$ compared to the Planck length $L_{pl} = \sqrt{G} \sim 10^{-33} cm$.

delightful journey to the quantum gravity, it is necessary to pin down the precise object of quantization (\hbar or G ?) and clearly specify correct variables for quantization (spacetime itself or fields associated with the spacetime ?).

For the reason we pose the following two questions:²

Q1. Is gravity fundamental or emergent ?

Q2. Which quantization defines quantum gravity ? \hbar or G ?

In **Q1** we usually refer a physical entity (force or field) to being *fundamental* when it does not have any superordinate substructure. The *emergence* usually means the arising of novel and coherent structures, patterns and properties through the collective interactions of more fundamental entities; for example, the superconductivity in condensed matter system or the organization of life in biology.

Regarding to the question **Q1**, it is quite amazing to notice that the picture of emergent gravity was already incoded in the Cartan's formulation of gravity [1]. In general relativity the gravitational force is represented by a Riemannian metric of curved spacetime manifold M

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\right)^2 = g^{\mu\nu}(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu}. \quad (1.1)$$

It was E. Cartan to show that the metric (1.1) can be defined by the tensor product of two vector fields $E_a = E_a^\mu(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} \in \Gamma(TM)$ as follows

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\right)^2 = \eta^{ab} E_a \otimes E_b. \quad (1.2)$$

Mathematically, a vector field X on a smooth manifold M is a derivation of the algebra $C^\infty(M)$. Here the vector fields $E_a \in \Gamma(TM)$ are the smooth sections of tangent bundle $TM \rightarrow M$ which are dual to the vector space $E^a = E_a^\mu(y) dy^\mu \in \Gamma(T^*M)$, i.e., $\langle E^b, E_a \rangle = \delta_a^b$. The expression (1.2) glimpses the avatar of gravity that a spin-two graviton might arise as a composite of two spin-one *vector fields*. In other words, Eq. (1.2) can be abstracted by the relation $(1 \otimes 1)_S = 2 \oplus 0$. Incidentally both mathematician and physicist are using the same word, *vector field*, in spite of a bit different meaning.

Eq. (1.2) suggests that we need gauge fields taking values in the Lie algebra of diffeomorphisms, in order to realize a composite graviton from spin-one vector fields. To be precise, the vector fields $E_a = E_a^\mu(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} \in \Gamma(TM)$ will be identified with “0-dimensional” gauge fields satisfying the Lie algebra

$$[E_a, E_b] = -f_{ab}^c E_c. \quad (1.3)$$

Of course, the Standard Model does not have such kind of gauge fields. But we will see later that the desired vector fields arise from electromagnetic fields living in noncommutative spacetime (1.8) [2, 3, 4, 5]. Thus the noncommutative spacetime will allow a novel unification between electromagnetism and Einstein gravity in a completely different context from the Kaluza-Klein unification.

²A problem that seems insurmountable is just seemingly so because we have not asked the right question. You should always ask the right question and then you can solve the problem. – Niels Henrik Abel (1802-1829)

Regarding to the question **Q2**, we are willing to ponder on the possibility that the Newton constant G signifies an intrinsic Poisson structure $\theta = \frac{1}{2}\theta^{\mu\nu}(y)\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu} \in \bigwedge^2 TM$ of spacetime because the gravitational constant G carries the physical dimension of $(\text{length})^2$ in the natural unit. Recall that the particle phase space P has its intrinsic Poisson structure $\eta = \hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}$ [6] so that

$$\{f, g\}_\hbar(x, p) = \hbar \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^i} \right) \quad (1.4)$$

where $f, g \in C^\infty(P)$. Here we intentionally inserted the Planck constant \hbar into η to make it dimensionless like as θ . Then the canonical quantization can be done by associating to a commutative algebra $C^\infty(P)$ of physical observables of a classical mechanical system, a noncommutative algebra \mathcal{A}_\hbar of linear operators on a suitable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . That is, the physical observables $f, g \in C^\infty(P)$ are replaced by self-adjoint operators $\hat{f}, \hat{g} \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar$ acting on \mathcal{H} and the Poisson bracket (1.4) is replaced by a quantum bracket

$$\{f, g\}_\hbar \rightarrow -i[\hat{f}, \hat{g}]. \quad (1.5)$$

This completes the quantization of mechanics of particle system whose phase space P is now noncommutative.

In the same way one can define a Poisson bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\theta : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ using the Poisson structure $\theta \in \bigwedge^2 TM$ of spacetime manifold M :

$$\{f, g\}_\theta(x) = \theta(df, dg) = \theta^{\mu\nu}(y) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y^\mu} \frac{\partial g}{\partial y^\nu} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial y^\nu} \frac{\partial g}{\partial y^\mu} \right) \quad (1.6)$$

where $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$. In the case where $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ is a constant cosymplectic matrix of rank $2n$, one can apply the same canonical quantization to the Poisson manifold (M, θ) . One can associate to a commutative algebra $(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\}_\theta)$ of smooth functions defined on the spacetime M , a noncommutative algebra \mathcal{A}_θ of linear operators on a suitable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . That is, the smooth functions $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$ become noncommutative operators (fields) $\hat{f}, \hat{g} \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$ acting on \mathcal{H} and the Poisson bracket (1.6) is replaced by a noncommutative bracket [7, 8]

$$\{f, g\}_\theta \rightarrow -i[\hat{f}, \hat{g}]. \quad (1.7)$$

This completes the quantization of Poisson algebra $(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\}_\theta)$ where spacetime M is now noncommutative, i.e.,

$$[y^\mu, y^\nu] = i\theta^{\mu\nu}. \quad (1.8)$$

Throughout the paper we will omit the hat for noncommutative coordinates $y^\mu \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$ for notational convenience.

The question still remains. What is the relation between the Poisson algebra $(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\}_\theta)$ and (quantum) gravity? We will not try to answer to the question right now. Instead we want to point out that the vector fields in Eq.(1.2) can be derived from the Poisson algebra [2, 3, 4, 5].

It is well-known [6] that, for a given Poisson algebra $(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\}_\theta)$, there exists a natural map $C^\infty(M) \rightarrow TM : f \mapsto X_f$ between smooth functions in $C^\infty(M)$ and vector fields in TM such that

$$X_f(g) = \{g, f\}_\theta \quad (1.9)$$

for any $g \in C^\infty(M)$. Indeed the assignment (1.9) between a Hamiltonian function f and the corresponding Hamiltonian vector field X_f is the Lie algebra homomorphism in the sense

$$X_{\{f,g\}_\theta} = -[X_f, X_g] \quad (1.10)$$

where the right-hand side represents the Lie bracket between the Hamiltonian vector fields.

Motivated by the homomorphism between the Poisson algebra $(C^\infty(M), \{\cdot, \cdot\}_\theta)$ and the Lie algebra of vector fields [6], one may venture to formulate Einstein gravity in terms of symplectic or Poisson geometry rather than Riemannian geometry. Suppose that there is a set of fields defined on a symplectic manifold M

$$\{D_a(y) \in C^\infty(M) | y \in M, a = 1, \dots, 2n\}. \quad (1.11)$$

According to the map (1.9), the smooth functions in Eq.(1.11) can be mapped to vector fields as follows

$$V_a[f](y) \equiv \{D_a(y), f(y)\}_\theta = -\theta^{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial D_a(y)}{\partial y^\nu} \frac{\partial f(y)}{\partial y^\mu}. \quad (1.12)$$

The vector fields $V_a(y) = V_a^\mu(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} \in \Gamma(TM)$ take values in the Lie algebra of volume-preserving diffeomorphisms because $\partial_\mu V_a^\mu = 0$ by definition. Because the vector fields V_a need not be orthonormal though they are orthogonal frames, it will be possible to relate the vector fields $V_a \in \Gamma(TM)$ to the orthonormal frames (vielbeins) E_a in Eq.(1.2) by $V_a = \lambda E_a$ with $\lambda \in C^\infty(M)$ to be determined [5].

Our above reasoning implies that a field theory equipped with the fields in Eq.(1.11) on a symplectic or Poisson manifold may give rise to Einstein gravity. If this is the case, quantum gravity will be much more accessible because there is a natural symplectic or Poisson structure and so it is obvious how to quantize the underlying system, as was already done in Eqs.(1.7) and (1.8). Following this line of thought, we will aim to answer to what quantum gravity is by carefully addressing the issues Q1 and Q2.

1.2 Quartet of physical constants

The physical constants defining a theory prescribe all essential properties of the theory. It was M. Planck to realize that the union of three “fundamental” constants in Nature, the Planck constant \hbar in quantum mechanics, the universal velocity c in relativity, and the Newton constant G in gravity,

uniquely fixes characteristic scales for quantum gravity:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{pl} &= \sqrt{\frac{c\hbar}{G}} = 2.2 \times 10^{-5} g, \\ L_{pl} &= \sqrt{\frac{G\hbar}{c^3}} = 1.6 \times 10^{-33} cm, \\ T_{pl} &= \sqrt{\frac{G\hbar}{c^5}} = 5.4 \times 10^{-44} s. \end{aligned} \tag{1.13}$$

The expression (1.13) holds in four dimensions and it has a different expression in other dimensions. It is interesting that one cannot construct a dimensionless quantity out of the three constants except in two dimensions. In two dimensions the combination $G\hbar/c^3$ is a dimensionless quantity. It can be understood by noticing that pure two-dimensional gravity is topological and so it should not trigger any dynamical scale. Therefore, except the two dimensions, each constant must play an independent role in the theory of quantum gravity.

Recent developments in theoretical physics reveal in many ways that gravity may be not a fundamental but an emergent phenomenon, especially, as string theory has demonstrated in the last decade [9]. This means that the Newton constant G can be determined by some quantities defining the theory of emergent gravity. Because we want to derive the gravity from some gauge theory, it is proper to consider the quartet of physical constants by adding a coupling constant e which is the electric charge but sometimes it will be denoted with g_{YM} to refer to a general gauge coupling constant. Using the symbol L for length, T for time, M for mass, and writing $[X]$ for the dimensions of some physical quantity X , we have the following in D dimensions

$$\begin{aligned} [\hbar] &= ML^2T^{-1}, \\ [c] &= LT^{-1}, \\ [e^2] &= ML^{D-1}T^{-2}, \\ [G] &= M^{-1}L^{D-1}T^{-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

A remarkable point of the system (1.14) is that it specifies the following intrinsic scales independently of dimensions:

$$\begin{aligned} M^2 &= \left[\frac{e^2}{G} \right], \\ L^2 &= \left[\frac{G\hbar^2}{e^2c^2} \right], \\ T^2 &= \left[\frac{G\hbar^2}{e^2c^4} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{1.15}$$

From the four dimensional case where $e^2/\hbar c \approx 1/137$, one can see that the scales in (1.15) are not so different from the Planck scales in (1.13).

Note that the first relation $GM^2 = e^2$ in (1.15) implies that at the mass scale M the gravitational and electromagnetic interactions become of equal strength. This is a desirable property for our purpose because we want to derive gravity from gauge theory ! Also it should be expected that the system (1.14) admits a dimensionless quantity because the four quantities are determined by three variables. It is given by the following combination

$$\left(\frac{ec}{\sqrt{G\hbar}}\right)^D \cdot \frac{\hbar^3 G^2}{c^5 e^2} = \text{dimensionless}. \quad (1.16)$$

One can see from Eq.(1.16) that in lower dimensions it is possible to construct a dimensionless quantity out of three only: $\{\hbar, c, G\}$ in $D = 2$, $\{c, e, G\}$ in $D = 3$, $\{\hbar, c, e\}$ in $D = 4$, and $\{\hbar, e, G\}$ in $D = 5$. In $D \geq 6$ dimensions, we need all of the four constants in Eq.(1.14) to have a dimensionless quantity. It smells of a hidden interesting physics but we could not figure out what it is. But we will obviously see what the scale in Eq.(1.15) set by the system (1.14) means. Notice that the length L in Eq.(1.15) is the Compton wavelength of mass M where the gravitational and electromagnetic interactions have the same strength. It is also the scale of spacetime noncommutativity where the conspiracy between gravity and gauge theory takes place.

Eq.(1.15) implies that, if gauge theory whose coupling constant is given by e is equipped with an intrinsic length scale L , the Newton constant G can be determined by field theory parameters only, i.e., $\frac{G\hbar^2}{c^2} \sim e^2 L^2$, hinting an intimate correspondence between gravity and gauge theory [5]. For example, a noncommutative gauge theory and a field theory on a D-brane are the cases where L^2 can be identified with $|\theta|$, the noncommutativity of spacetime, for the former and $2\pi\alpha'$, the size of string, for the latter.³ As we will discuss later, a theory of quantum gravity must be background independent and thus the dynamical scale for quantum gravity will be generated by a vacuum condensate which is precisely the one in (1.15).

1.3 Noncommutative spacetime as quantum geometry

We glimpsed some reasons why the gravitational constant G dictates a symplectic or Poisson structure to spacetime M . Thereby a field theory will be defined on the symplectic manifold and, as we argued before, Einstein gravity may arise from the field theory. If this is the case, quantum gravity will be defined by quantizing a field theory in terms of the underlying Poisson structure. It is simply the Dirac quantization for a canonical symplectic structure such as Eq.(1.6). Therefore, if all these are smoothly working, it means that quantum geometry can be defined by a field theory on noncommutative space such as (1.8). Let us briefly sketch how it is possible.

³The theory on a D-brane also needs an intrinsic length parameter because it is always defined with the action $\int_M \sqrt{\det(g + 2\pi\alpha' F)}$ and so $\alpha' \equiv l_s^2$ should carry the dimension of (length)² for dimensional reason. Because the parameter l_s^2 disappears from the theory if $F = 0$, it is necessary for the field strength F to be nowhere vanishing in order for the parameter l_s^2 to have an operational meaning as an intrinsic length scale of the theory. In this case where $\langle F \rangle_{r \rightarrow \infty} \equiv B$, the two theories will be physically equivalent as was shown in [10].

A symplectic structure $B = \frac{1}{2}B_{\mu\nu}dy^\mu \wedge dy^\nu$ of spacetime M defines a Poisson structure $\theta^{\mu\nu} \equiv (B^{-1})^{\mu\nu}$ on M where $\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, 2n$. The Dirac quantization with respect to the Poisson structure $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ then leads to the quantum phase space (1.8). Because the Poisson structure $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ defines canonical pairs between noncommutative coordinates $y^\mu \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$, one can introduce annihilation and creation operators, a_i and a_j^\dagger with $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, respectively, using those pairs. For example, $a_1 = (y^1 + iy^2)/\sqrt{2\theta^{12}}$, $a_1^\dagger = (y^1 - iy^2)/\sqrt{2\theta^{12}}$, etc. Then the Moyal algebra (1.8) is equal to the Heisenberg algebra of an n -dimensional harmonic oscillator, i.e.,

$$[y^\mu, y^\nu] = i\theta^{\mu\nu} \Leftrightarrow [a_i, a_j^\dagger] = \delta_{ij}. \quad (1.17)$$

It is a well-known fact from quantum mechanics that the representation space of noncommutative \mathbf{R}^{2n} is given by an infinite-dimensional, separable Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H} = \{|\vec{n}\rangle \equiv |n_1, \dots, n_n\rangle, n_i = 0, 1, \dots\} \quad (1.18)$$

which is orthonormal, i.e., $\langle \vec{n} | \vec{m} \rangle = \delta_{\vec{n}\vec{m}}$ and complete, i.e., $\sum_{\vec{n}=0}^{\infty} |\vec{n}\rangle \langle \vec{n}| = 1$. Note that every noncommutative space can be represented as a theory of operators in an appropriate Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , which consists of noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ like as a set of observables in quantum mechanics. Therefore any field $\hat{\Phi} \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$ in the noncommutative space (1.17) becomes an operator acting on the Fock space \mathcal{H} and can be expanded in terms of the complete operator basis

$$\mathcal{A}_\theta = \{|\vec{n}\rangle \langle \vec{m}|, n_i, m_j = 0, 1, \dots\}, \quad (1.19)$$

that is,

$$\hat{\Phi}(y) = \sum_{\vec{n}, \vec{m}} \Phi_{\vec{n}\vec{m}} |\vec{n}\rangle \langle \vec{m}|. \quad (1.20)$$

One may use the ‘Cantor diagonal method’ to put the n -dimensional positive integer lattice in \mathcal{H} into a one-to-one correspondence with the infinite set of natural numbers (i.e., 1-dimensional positive integer lattice): $|\vec{n}\rangle \leftrightarrow |n\rangle$, $n = 1, \dots, N \rightarrow \infty$. In this one-dimensional basis, Eq.(1.20) can be relabeled as the following form

$$\hat{\Phi}(y) = \sum_{n,m=1}^{\infty} M_{nm} |n\rangle \langle m|. \quad (1.21)$$

One can regard M_{nm} in Eq.(1.21) as elements of an $N \times N$ matrix M in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit. We then get the following important relation [7, 8]:

$$\text{Any field on noncommutative } \mathbf{R}^{2n} \cong N \times N \text{ matrix at } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.22)$$

If the field $\Phi(y) \in C^\infty(M)$ was originally a real field, then M should be a Hermitian matrix. The relation (1.22) means that a field in the noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ can be regarded as a master field of a large N matrix.

Now the very notion of point in a noncommutative space such as the Moyal space (1.8) is doomed, instead it is replaced by a state in \mathcal{H} . So the usual concept of geometry based on a smooth manifold

would be replaced by a theory of operator algebra, e.g., the noncommutative geometry *à la* Connes [11] or the theory of deformation quantization *à la* Kontsevich [12]. Furthermore, through the matrix representation (1.22) of the operator algebra, one can achieve a coordinate-free description of quantum field theory. Therefore it would be possible to achieve a *background independent* formulation of quantum gravity where the interactions between fundamental ingredients can be defined without introducing any spacetime structure [5]. For that purpose, the most natural objects are algebra-valued fields, which can be identified with elements in noncommutative \star -algebra such as noncommutative gauge fields.

Several matrix models [13, 14, 15] have appeared in string theory. They illustrated how the matrix model can be regarded as a nonperturbative formulation of gravity or string theory in the sense that it describes a quantized geometry with an arbitrary topology. The matrix theory contains multiple branes with arbitrary topologies as its spectrum and allows the topology change of spacetime manifold as a sequence of the change of matrix data [16].

1.4 Outline of the paper

In this review we will not survey other approaches about emergent gravity because good expositions [17] already exist and our approach is quite different although an underlying philosophy may be the same. Our unique clue is based on the fact that Einstein gravity can be formulated in terms of symplectic geometry [5]. Basically we are considering a symplectic geometry as a commutative limit of noncommutative geometry which is regarded as a microscopic structure of spacetime, like as the classical mechanics in a mundane scale is simply a coarse graining of quantum mechanics at atomic world. Riemannian geometry thus appears at a macroscopic world as a coarse graining of the noncommutative geometry, as we already briefly outlined.

Our line of thought has been motivated by several similar ideas, mostly by the AdS/CFT correspondence [18] and matrix models [13, 14, 15] in string theory. Also the work by Rivelles [19] and the following works [20] triggered to think about a noncommutative field theory as a theory of gravity. A series of interesting works along this line has recently been conducted by Steinacker and his collaborators [21, 22, 23]. See his recent review [24] and references therein. Also there are many closely related works [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33]. By the way the emergent gravity based on noncommutative field theories is relatively new. So it would be premature to have an extensive review about this subject because it is still in an early stage of development. Therefore we will focus on ours.

Although this review is basically a coherent survey of the recent works [2, 3, 4, 5, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38] of the second author, it also contains several new results and many clarifications, together with important pictures about quantum gravity. Early reviews are [35, 36].

In Section 2 we elucidate the reason why Einstein gravity can emerge from the electromagnetism as long as spacetime admits a symplectic structure and explicitly show how Einstein's equations can be derived from the equations of motion for electromagnetic fields on a symplectic spacetime. The

emergent gravity we propose here actually corresponds to a field theory realization of open-closed string duality or large N duality in string theory and a generalization of homological mirror symmetry [39] in the sense that the deformation of symplectic structure ω is isomorphic to the deformation of Riemannian metric g in the triple (M, g, ω) .

In Section 2.1, we explain the equivalence principle for the electromagnetic force, stating that there always exists a coordinate transformation to locally eliminate the electromagnetic force if space-time supports a symplectic structure. This important property for emergent gravity is inherited from the Darboux theorem [40] or the Moser lemma [41] in symplectic geometry, which also explains how diffeomorphism symmetry in general relativity arises from such an electromagnetism. It is shown how the equations of motion for $U(1)$ gauge fields are mapped to those for vector fields defined by (1.12).

In Section 2.2, we first initiate the emergent gravity by showing [2] that self-dual electromagnetism on a symplectic 4-manifold is equivalent to self-dual Einstein gravity. Although it was previously proved in [5], we newly prove it again in a more geometric way to illustrate how elegant and beautiful the emergent gravity is.

In Section 2.3, we derive the Einstein's equations from the electromagnetism on a symplectic manifold, rigorously confirming the speculation in Section 1.1. We found [5] that the emergent gravity from the electromagnetism predicts some exotic energy whose physical nature will be identified in Section 5.2.

In Section 3, we discuss how to quantize Einstein gravity in the context of emergent gravity by the canonical quantization (1.7) of a spacetime Poisson structure.

We argue in Section 3.1 that the equivalence principle for the emergent gravity can be lifted to a noncommutative spacetime such as (1.8). The equivalence principle in a noncommutative spacetime is realized as a gauge equivalence between star products in the context of deformation quantization [12], so dubbed as the “quantum equivalence principle” [3]. This implies that quantum gravity can consistently be derived from the quantum equivalence principle and matter fields can arise from the quantized spacetime.

In Section 3.2, it is shown [4] that the emergent gravity from a noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ can be understood as a large N duality such as the AdS/CFT correspondence and matrix models in string theory. The gravitational metric determined by large N matrices or noncommutative gauge fields is explicitly derived.

We show in Section 3.3 how the background independent formulation can be achieved for emergent gravity where any kind of spacetime structure is not *a priori* assumed. An important picture of emergent gravity is identified. In order to describe a classical geometry from a background independent theory, it is necessary to have a nontrivial vacuum defined by a coherent condensation of gauge fields, e.g., the vacuum defined by (1.17), which is also the origin of spacetime symplectic or Poisson structure such as (1.6).

In Section 3.4, the emergent gravity is generalized to a general noncommutative spacetime such

as the case with $\theta^{\mu\nu} = \text{nonconstant}$ [3] and a general Poisson manifold [38].

In Section 4, we identify what particles and matter fields are and how they arise from a noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ . We claim that a matter field such as quarks and leptons is defined by a stable localized geometry, which is a topological object in the defining algebra (noncommutative \star -algebra) of quantum gravity [5].

First we review in Section 4.1 the Feynman's view [42, 43, 44] about the electrodynamics of a charged particle to convince that an extra internal space is necessary to introduce the weak and strong forces. The extra dimensions appear with a Poisson structure of Lie algebra type implemented with some localizability condition to stabilize the internal space.

In Section 4.2, we understand the Feynman's derivation of gauge forces as the Darboux transformation (2.7) between two symplectic structures where one of them is a deformation of the other in terms of external gauge fields. This beautiful idea is not ours but was noticed by Souriau and Sternberg [45] long ago.

In Section 4.3, we define a stable state in a large N gauge theory and relate it to the K-theory [46, 47, 48, 49]. Using the correspondence (1.22), the K-theory class is mapped to the K-theory of noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ . We deduce using the well-known but rather mysterious math, the Atiyah-Bott-Shapiro construction of K-theory generators in terms of Clifford module [50], that the topological object defined by large N matrices or the noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ describes fermions such as quarks and leptons. It turns out that the extra noncommutative space is essential to realize the weak and strong forces.

In Section 5, we discuss the most beautiful aspects of emergent gravity. Remarkably the emergent gravity reveals a noble picture about the origin of spacetime, dubbed as emergent spacetime, which is radically different from any previous physical theory all of which describe what happens in a given spacetime.

In Section 5.1, we point out that the concept of emergent time is naturally defined as long as spacetime admits an intrinsic symplectic or Poisson structure. The time evolution of a spacetime geometry is defined by the Hamilton's equation defined by the spacetime Poisson structure (1.6). Because the symplectic structure triggered by the vacuum condensate (1.17) not only causes the emergence of spacetime but also specifies an orientation of spacetime manifold, it also implies that the emergent gravity may explain the arrow of time in the cosmic evolution of our Universe - the most notoriously difficult problem in quantum gravity.

We analyze in Section 5.2 the anatomy of spacetime derived from a noncommutative gauge theory or large N matrix model. We explain why there is no cosmological constant problem in emergent gravity [37]. We point out that a vacuum energy of Planck scale does not gravitate unlike as Einstein gravity and a flat spacetime is not free gratis but a result of Planck energy condensation in vacuum. Finally we identify the physical nature of the exotic energy-momentum tensor whose existence was predicted in Section 2.3. Surprisingly it mimics all the properties of dark energy, so we suggest the energy as a plausible candidate of dark energy [5]. If so, the quantum gravity defined by noncom-

mutative geometry seems to resolve many notorious problems in theoretical physics, for example, to resolve the cosmological constant problem, to understand the nature of dark energy and to explain why gravity is so weak compared to other forces.

In the final section, we try to understand why the emergent gravity defined by noncommutative geometry is so resembling the string theory. We conclude with several remarks about important open issues and speculate a proper mathematical framework for the emergent gravity and quantum gravity.

2 Emergent Gravity

In order to argue that gravity can emerge from some field theory, it is important to identify how essential properties of gravity can be realized in the underlying field theory. If not, the emergent gravity could not physically be viable. Therefore we will rigorously show how the equivalence principle, the most important property in the theory of gravity (general relativity), can be realized from $U(1)$ gauge theory on a symplectic manifold M . Through the realization of the equivalence principle in the context of symplectic geometry, we can understand how diffeomorphism symmetry arises from noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory and so gravity can emerge from the noncommutative electromagnetism, which is also an interacting theory.

2.1 The equivalence principle from symplectic geometry

Consider a $U(1)$ bundle supported on a symplectic manifold (M, B) . Physically we are considering open strings moving on a D-brane whose data are given by (M, g, B) where M is a smooth manifold equipped with a metric g and a symplectic structure B . The worldsheet action of open strings, with a compact notation, reads as

$$S = \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int_{\Sigma} |dX|^2 - \int_{\Sigma} B - \int_{\partial\Sigma} A, \quad (2.1)$$

where $X : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ is a map from an open string worldsheet Σ to a target spacetime M and $B(\Sigma) = X^*B(M)$ and $A(\partial\Sigma) = X^*A(M)$ are pull-backs of spacetime gauge fields to the worldsheet Σ and the worldsheet boundary $\partial\Sigma$, respectively.

From the compact notation in Eq.(2.1), it is obvious that the string action (2.1) respects the following local symmetries:

(I) $\text{Diff}(M)$ -symmetry

$$X \rightarrow X' = X'(X) \in \text{Diff}(M), \quad (2.2)$$

(II) Λ -symmetry

$$(B, A) \rightarrow (B - d\Lambda, A + \Lambda), \quad (2.3)$$

where the gauge parameter Λ is a one-form in M . Note that the Λ -symmetry is present only when $B \neq 0$, so a stringy symmetry by nature. When $B = 0$, the symmetry (2.3) is reduced to $A \rightarrow A + d\lambda$, which is the ordinary $U(1)$ gauge symmetry because A is a connection of $U(1)$ bundle.

The Λ -symmetry then predicts a very important result. The presence of $U(1)$ bundle on a symplectic manifold (M, B) should appear only with the combination $\Omega = B + F$ where $F = dA$ because Ω is the only gauge-invariant 2-form under the transformation (2.3). Because we regard $B \in \bigwedge^2(T^*M)$ as the symplectic structure over M , it means that the electromagnetic force $F = dA$ appears only as the local deformation of symplectic structure $\Omega(x) = (B + F)(x)$.

The other important result derived from the open string action (2.1) is that the triple (M, g, B) comes only into the combination $(M, g + \kappa B)$ where $\kappa \equiv 2\pi\alpha' = 2\pi l_s^2$ denotes the string scale. Note that the Riemannian metric g and the symplectic structure B in the triple (M, g, B) can be regarded as an bundle isomorphism from the tangent bundle TM to the cotangent bundle T^*M because both are nondegenerate bilinear maps on TM , i.e., $(g, B) : TM \rightarrow T^*M$. Therefore the so-called DBI “metric” $g + \kappa B : TM \rightarrow T^*M$ which maps $X \in TM$ to $\xi = (g + \kappa B)(X) \in T^*M$ embodies a generalized geometry [51] continuously interpolating between symplectic geometry ($|\kappa B g^{-1}| \gg 1$) and Riemannian geometry ($|\kappa B g^{-1}| \ll 1$). Including the excitation of open strings, one can combine the two results to conclude that the data of ‘D-manifold’ are given by $(M, g, \Omega) = (M, g + \kappa \Omega)$.

Consider an another D-brane whose ‘D-manifold’ is described by different data $(N, G, B) = (N, G + \kappa B)$. A question is whether there exist a diffeomorphism $\phi : N \rightarrow M$ such that $\phi^*(g + \kappa \Omega) = G + \kappa B$ on N . In order to answer the question, let us shortly digress to some important aspects of symplectic geometry.

The symplectic geometry respects an important property, known as the Darboux theorem [40], stating that every symplectic manifold of the same dimension is locally indistinguishable [6]. To be precise, let (M, ω) be a symplectic manifold. Consider a smooth family $\omega_t = \omega_0 + t(\omega_1 - \omega_0)$ of symplectic forms joining ω_0 to ω_1 where $[\omega_0] = [\omega_1] \in H^2(M)$ and ω_t is symplectic $\forall t \in [0, 1]$. A remarkable point (due to the Moser lemma [41]) is that there exists a one-parameter family of diffeomorphisms $\phi : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ such that $\phi_t^*(\omega_t) = \omega_0$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$. If there exist such diffeomorphisms as a flow generated by time-dependent vector fields $X_t \equiv \frac{d\phi_t}{dt} \circ \phi_t^{-1}$, one would have for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$ that

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_t}\omega_t + \frac{d\omega_t}{dt} = 0 \quad (2.4)$$

because, by the Lie derivative formula, one has

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \frac{d}{dt}(\phi_t^*\omega_t) &= \phi_t^*(\mathcal{L}_{X_t}\omega_t) + \phi_t^*\frac{d\omega_t}{dt} \\ &= \phi_t^*\left(\mathcal{L}_{X_t}\omega_t + \frac{d\omega_t}{dt}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Using the Cartan’s magic formula, $\mathcal{L}_X = d\iota_X + \iota_X d$, for the Lie derivative along the flow of a vector field X , one can see that Eq.(2.4) can be reduced to the Moser’s equation

$$\iota_{X_t}\omega_t + A = 0 \quad (2.6)$$

where $\omega_1 - \omega_0 = dA$.

In summary, there always exists a one-parameter family of diffeomorphisms as a flow generated by a smooth family of time-dependent vector fields X_t satisfying Eq.(2.6) for the change of the symplectic structure within the same cohomology class from ω_0 to ω_1 where $\omega_1 - \omega_0 = dA$. The evolution of the symplectic structure is locally described by the flow ϕ_t of X_t satisfying $\frac{d\phi_t}{dt} = X_t \circ \phi_t$ and starting at $\phi_0 = \text{identity}$. Thus one has $\phi_1^* \omega_1 = \phi_0^* \omega_0 = \omega_0$, and so ϕ_1 provides a chart describing the evolution from ω_0 to $\omega_1 = \omega_0 + dA$. In terms of local coordinates, there always exists a coordinate transformation ϕ_1 whose pullback maps $\omega_1 = \omega_0 + dA$ to ω_0 , i.e., $\phi_1 : y \mapsto x = x(y)$ so that

$$\frac{\partial x^a}{\partial y^\mu} \frac{\partial x^b}{\partial y^\nu} \omega_{1ab}(x) = \omega_{0\mu\nu}(y). \quad (2.7)$$

This can directly be applied to the open string case (2.1) by considering a local Darboux chart $(U; y^1, \dots, y^{2n})$ centered at $p \in U$ and valid on an open neighborhood $U \subset M$ such that $\omega_0|_U = \frac{1}{2} B_{\mu\nu} dy^\mu \wedge dy^\nu$ where $B_{\mu\nu}$ is a constant symplectic matrix of rank $2n$. Now consider a flow $\phi_t : U \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ generated by the vector field X_t satisfying (2.6). Under the action of ϕ_ϵ with an infinitesimal ϵ , one finds that the point $p \in U$ whose coordinates are y^μ is mapped to $\phi_\epsilon(y) \equiv x^\mu(y) = y^\mu + \epsilon X^\mu(y)$. Using the inverse map $\phi_\epsilon^{-1} : x^\mu \mapsto y^\mu(x) = x^\mu - \epsilon X^\mu(x)$, the symplectic structure $\omega_0|_U = \frac{1}{2} B_{\mu\nu}(y) dy^\mu \wedge dy^\nu$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_\epsilon^{-1})^*(\omega_0|_y) &= \frac{1}{2} B_{\mu\nu}(x - \epsilon X) d(x^\mu - \epsilon X^\mu) \wedge d(x^\nu - \epsilon X^\nu) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{2} \left[B_{\mu\nu} - \epsilon X^a (\partial_a B_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\nu B_{a\mu} + \partial_\mu B_{\nu a}) + \epsilon \left(\partial_\mu (B_{\nu a} X^a) - \partial_\nu (B_{\mu a} X^a) \right) \right] dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \\ &\equiv B + \epsilon F \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where $A_\mu(x) = B_{\mu a}(x) X^a(x)$ or $\iota_X B + A = 0$ and $dB = 0$ was used for the vanishing of the second term. Eq.(2.8) can be rewritten as $\phi_\epsilon^*(B + \epsilon F) = B$, which means that the electromagnetic force $F = dA$ can always be eliminated by a local coordinate transformation generated by the vector field X satisfying Eq.(2.6).

Now let us go back to the previous question. We considered a symmetry transformation which is a combination of the Λ -transformation (2.3) followed by a diffeomorphism $\phi : N \rightarrow M$. It transforms the DBI metric $g + \kappa B$ on M according to $g + \kappa B \rightarrow \phi^*(g + \kappa \Omega)$. The crux is that there exists a diffeomorphism $\phi : N \rightarrow M$ such that $\phi^*(\Omega) = B$, which is precisely the Darboux transformation (2.7) in symplectic geometry. Then we arrive at a remarkable fact [5] that two different DBI metrics $g + \kappa \Omega$ and $G + \kappa B$ are diffeomorphic each other, i.e.,

$$\phi^*(g + \kappa \Omega) = G + \kappa B, \quad (2.9)$$

where $G = \phi^*(g)$. Because the open string theory (2.1) respects the diffeomorphism symmetry (2.2), the D-manifolds described by (M, g, Ω) and (N, G, B) must be physically equivalent. Note that this property holds for any pair (g, B) of Riemannian metric g and symplectic structure B .

The above argument reveals a superb physics in the gauge theory. There “always” exists a coordinate transformation to locally eliminate the electromagnetic force $F = dA$ as long as a manifold M supports a symplectic structure B , i.e., (M, B) defines a symplectic manifold. That is, a symplectic structure on spacetime manifold M admits a novel form of the equivalence principle, known as the Darboux theorem, for the geometrization of the electromagnetism. Because it is always possible to find a coordinate transformation $\phi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ such that $\phi^*(B + F) = B$, the relationship $\phi^*(g + \kappa(B + F)) = G + \kappa B$ clearly shows that the electromagnetic fields in the DBI metric $g + \kappa(B + F)$ now appear as a new metric $G = \phi^*(g)$ after the Darboux transformation (2.9). One may also consider the inverse relationship $\phi_*(G + \kappa B) = g + \kappa(B + F)$ which implies that a non-trivial metric G in the background B can be interpreted as an inhomogeneous condensation of gauge fields on a ‘D-manifold’ with metric g . It might be pointed out that the relationship in the case of $\kappa = 2\pi\alpha' = 0$ is the familiar diffeomorphism in Riemannian geometry and so it says nothing marvelous. See the footnote 3.

We observed that the Darboux transformation between symplectic structures immediately leads to the diffeomorphism between two different DBI metrics. In terms of local coordinates $\phi : y \mapsto x = x(y)$, the diffeomorphism (2.9) explicitly reads as

$$(g + \kappa\Omega)_{ab}(x) = \frac{\partial y^\mu}{\partial x^a} \left(G_{\mu\nu}(y) + \kappa B_{\mu\nu}(y) \right) \frac{\partial y^\nu}{\partial x^b} \quad (2.10)$$

where $\Omega = B + F$ and

$$G_{\mu\nu}(y) = \frac{\partial x^a}{\partial y^\mu} \frac{\partial x^b}{\partial y^\nu} g_{ab}(x). \quad (2.11)$$

Eq.(2.10) conclusively shows how gauge fields on a symplectic manifold manifest themselves as a spacetime geometry. To expose the intrinsic connection between gauge fields and spacetime geometry, let us represent the coordinate transformation in Eq.(2.10) as

$$x^a(y) = y^a + \theta^{ab} \hat{A}_b(y) \quad (2.12)$$

with $\theta^{ab} = (B^{-1})^{ab}$. Note that the coordinate transformation (2.12) for the case $F(x) = 0$ is trivial, i.e., $\hat{A}_a(y) = 0$ and $G_{ab} = g_{ab}$ as it should be, while it is nontrivial for $F(x) \neq 0$ and the nontrivial coordinate transformation is encoded into smooth functions $\hat{A}_a(y)$, which will be identified with noncommutative gauge fields. Clearly Eq.(2.11) embodies how the metric on M is deformed by the presence of noncommutative gauge fields.

We showed how the diffeomorphism symmetry (2.9) between two different DBI metrics arises from $U(1)$ gauge theory on a symplectic manifold. Surprisingly (at least to us) the diffeomorphism symmetry (2.9) is realized as a novel form of the equivalence principle for the electromagnetic force [3]. Therefore one may expect the electromagnetism on a symplectic manifold must be a theory of gravity, in other words, gravity can emerge from the electromagnetism on a symplectic or Poisson manifold.

A low energy effective field theory deduced from the open string action (2.1) describes an open string dynamics on a $(p + 1)$ -dimensional D-brane worldvolume [9]. The dynamics of D-branes is

described by open string field theory whose low energy effective action is obtained by integrating out all the massive modes, keeping only massless fields which are slowly varying at the string scale $\kappa = 2\pi l_s^2$. For a Dp -brane in closed string background fields, the action describing the resulting low energy dynamics is given by

$$S = \frac{2\pi}{g_s(2\pi\kappa)^{\frac{p+1}{2}}} \int d^{p+1}x \sqrt{\det(g + \kappa(B + F))} + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\kappa}\partial F, \dots), \quad (2.13)$$

where $F = dA$ is the field strength of $U(1)$ gauge fields. The DBI action (2.13) respects the two local symmetries, (2.2) and (2.3), as expected.

Note that ordinary $U(1)$ gauge symmetry is a special case of Eq.(2.3) where the gauge parameter Λ is exact, namely, $\Lambda = d\lambda$, so that $B \rightarrow B$, $A \rightarrow A + d\lambda$. One can see from Eq.(2.6) that the $U(1)$ gauge transformation is generated by a Hamiltonian vector field X_λ satisfying $\iota_{X_\lambda} B + d\lambda = 0$. Therefore the gauge symmetry acting on $U(1)$ gauge fields as $A \rightarrow A + d\lambda$ is a diffeomorphism symmetry generated by the vector field X_λ satisfying $\mathcal{L}_{X_\lambda} B = 0$ which is known as the symplectomorphism. We see here that the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry on the symplectic manifold (M, B) turns into a “spacetime” symmetry rather than an “internal” symmetry. This fact already implies an intimate connection between gauge fields on a symplectic manifold and spacetime geometry.

It was shown in Eq.(2.10) that the strong isotopy (2.7) between symplectic structures brings in the diffeomorphic equivalence (2.10) between two different DBI metrics, which in turn leads to a remarkable identity [52] between DBI actions

$$\int_M d^{p+1}x \sqrt{\det(g(x) + \kappa(B + F)(x))} = \int_N d^{p+1}y \sqrt{\det(G(y) + \kappa B(y))}. \quad (2.14)$$

The property (2.14) appearing in the geometrization of electromagnetism may be summarized in the context of derived category. More closely, if M is a complex manifold whose complex structure is given by J , we see that dynamical fields in the left-hand side of Eq.(2.14) act only as the deformation of symplectic structure $\Omega(x) = (B + F)(x)$ in the triple (M, J, Ω) , while those in the right-hand side of Eq.(2.14) appear only as the deformation of complex structure $K = \phi^*(J)$ in the triple (N, K, B) through the metric (2.11). In this notation, the identity (2.14) can thus be written as follows

$$(M, J, \Omega) \cong (N, K, B). \quad (2.15)$$

The equivalence (2.15) is very reminiscent of the homological mirror symmetry [39], stating the equivalence between the category of A-branes (derived Fukaya category corresponding to the triple (M, J, Ω)) and the category of B-branes (derived category of coherent sheaves corresponding to the triple (N, K, B)).

Because the open string action (2.1) basically describes a $U(1)$ -bundle (the Chan-Paton bundle) on a D-brane whose data are given by (M, g, B) , $U(1)$ gauge fields, the connection of the $U(1)$ bundle, are regarded as dynamical fields while the metric g and the two-form B are considered as background fields. But Eq.(2.14) clearly shows that gauge field fluctuations can be interpreted as a *dynamical*

metric on the brane given by (2.11). In all, one may wonder whether the right-hand side of Eq.(2.14) can be rewritten as a theory of gravity. Remarkably, it is the case, as will be shown soon.

Here we will use the background independent prescription [10] where the open string metric \widehat{g}_{ab} , the noncommutativity θ^{ab} and the open string coupling \widehat{g}_s are determined by

$$\theta^{ab} = \left(\frac{1}{B}\right)^{ab}, \quad \widehat{g}_{ab} = -\kappa^2 \left(B \frac{1}{g} B\right)_{ab}, \quad \widehat{g}_s = g_s \sqrt{\det(\kappa B g^{-1})}. \quad (2.16)$$

In terms of these parameters, the couplings are related by

$$\frac{1}{g_{YM}^2} = \frac{\kappa^{2-n}}{(2\pi)^{n-1} \widehat{g}_s}, \quad (2.17)$$

$$\frac{\sqrt{\det \widehat{g}}}{\widehat{g}_s} = \frac{\kappa^n}{g_s |\text{Pf} \theta|} \quad (2.18)$$

where $p+1 \equiv 2n$. For constant g and B , one can rewrite the right-hand side of Eq.(2.14) by using the open string variables and defining new covariant fields $D_a(y) \equiv B_{ab} x^b(y)$

$$\int d^{p+1}y \sqrt{\det(G(y) + \kappa B)} = \int d^{p+1}y \sqrt{\det(\kappa B + \kappa^2 \widehat{G}(y))}, \quad (2.19)$$

where

$$\widehat{G}_{\mu\nu}(y) = \widehat{g}^{ab} \frac{\partial D_a}{\partial y^\mu} \frac{\partial D_b}{\partial y^\nu}. \quad (2.20)$$

One can expand the right-hand side of Eq.(2.19) around the background B in powers of κ , arriving at the following result

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d^{p+1}y \sqrt{\det(\kappa B + \kappa^2 \widehat{G}(y))} \\ &= \int d^{p+1}y \sqrt{\det(\kappa B)} \left(1 + \frac{\kappa^2}{4} \widehat{g}^{ac} \widehat{g}^{bd} \{D_a, D_b\}_\theta \{D_c, D_d\}_\theta + \dots \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

where $\{D_a, D_b\}_\theta$ is the Poisson bracket defined by Eq.(1.6). The second part of Eq.(2.21) can then be written as the form with a constant metric $\widehat{g}^{ab} = -\frac{1}{\kappa^2}(\theta g \theta)^{ab}$

$$S_D = \frac{1}{4g_{YM}^2} \int d^{p+1}y \sqrt{\det \widehat{g}} \widehat{g}^{ac} \widehat{g}^{bd} \{D_a, D_b\}_\theta \{D_c, D_d\}_\theta, \quad (2.22)$$

along with recovering the gauge coupling constant g_{YM} after collecting all factors including the one in (2.13). From now on, let us set the metric $\widehat{g}^{ab} = \delta^{ab}$ for simplicity.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \{D_a, D_b\}_\theta &= -B_{ab} + \partial_a \widehat{A}_b - \partial_b \widehat{A}_a + \{\widehat{A}_a, \widehat{A}_b\}_\theta, \\ &\equiv -B_{ab} + \widehat{F}_{ab} \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\{D_a, \{D_b, D_c\}_\theta\}_\theta &= \partial_a \widehat{F}_{bc} + \{\widehat{A}_a, \widehat{F}_{bc}\}_\theta \\ &\equiv \widehat{D}_a \widehat{F}_{bc}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.24}$$

Therefore the Jacobi identity for the Poisson bracket (1.6) can be written as the form

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \{D_a, \{D_b, D_c\}_\theta\}_\theta + \{D_b, \{D_c, D_a\}_\theta\}_\theta + \{D_c, \{D_a, D_b\}_\theta\}_\theta \\ &= \widehat{D}_a \widehat{F}_{bc} + \widehat{D}_b \widehat{F}_{ca} + \widehat{D}_c \widehat{F}_{ab}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.25}$$

Similarly the equations of motion derived from the action (2.22) read as

$$\{D^a, \{D_a, D_b\}_\theta\}_\theta = \widehat{D}^a \widehat{F}_{ab} = 0.\tag{2.26}$$

Note that the electromagnetism on a symplectic manifold is a nonlinear interacting theory as the self-interaction in Eq.(2.23) clearly shows.

Going from the left-hand side of Eq.(2.14) to the right-hand side, we have eliminated the $U(1)$ gauge field in terms of the local coordinate transformation (2.12). Nevertheless, if one looks at the action (2.22) which was obtained by the expansion of DBI action free from gauge fields as Eq.(2.21), gauge fields seem to appear again at first appearance. One may thus suspect that the action (2.22) does not satisfy the equivalence principle we have justified before. But one has to notice that the gauge fields in (2.12) should be regarded as dynamical coordinates describing a fluctuating metric as (2.11). Rather an interesting point is that the fluctuation of the emergent metric (2.11) can be written as the form of gauge theory on a symplectic spacetime. This highlights a key feature to realize the gauge/gravity duality in noncommutative spacetime.

One can identify the defining fields $D_a(y) \in C^\infty(M)$, $a = 1, \dots, p+1 = 2n$, in the action (2.22) with the set (1.11) and, according to the map (1.12), the fields $D_a(y)$ can be mapped to vector fields $V_a \in \Gamma(TM)$. One can immediately see by identifying $f = D_a$ and $g = D_b$ and using the relation (2.23) that the Lie algebra homomorphism (1.10) leads to the following identity

$$X_{\widehat{F}_{ab}} = [V_a, V_b]\tag{2.27}$$

where $V_a \equiv X_{D_a}$ and $V_b \equiv X_{D_b}$. Similarly, using Eq.(2.24), one can further deduce that

$$X_{\widehat{D}_a \widehat{F}_{bc}} = [V_a, [V_b, V_c]].\tag{2.28}$$

Then the map (2.28) translates the Jacobi identity (2.25) and the equations of motion (2.26) into some relations between the vector fields V_a defined by (1.12). That is, we have the following correspondence [5]

$$\widehat{D}_{[a} \widehat{F}_{bc]} = 0 \Leftrightarrow [V_{[a}, [V_b, V_{c]}] = 0,\tag{2.29}$$

$$\widehat{D}^a \widehat{F}_{ab} = 0 \Leftrightarrow [V^a, [V_a, V_b]] = 0,\tag{2.30}$$

where $[a, b, c]$ denotes a fully antisymmetrization of indices (a, b, c) and the bracket between the vector fields on the right-hand side is defined by the Lie bracket.

As we remarked below Eq.(1.12), the vector fields $V_a \in \Gamma(TM)$ can be related to the vielbeins $E_a \in \Gamma(TM)$ in Eq.(1.2) by $V_a = \lambda E_a$ with $\lambda \in C^\infty(M)$ to be determined and so the double Lie brackets in (2.29) and (2.30) will be related to Riemann curvature tensors because they are involved with the second-order derivatives of the metric (1.1) or the vielbein (1.2). It will be rather straightforward to derive Einstein gravity from the set of equations (2.29) and (2.30), which is the subject of the following two subsections.

2.2 Warm-up with a beautiful example

First let us briefly summarize some aspects in differential geometry [1] which are useful in understanding some concepts of emergent gravity.

Let $E^a = E_\mu^a dy^\mu$ be the basis of 1-forms dual to a given frame $E_a = E_a^\mu \partial_\mu$. If we define the local matrix of connection 1-forms by

$$\omega^a_b = \omega_\mu^a{}_b dy^\mu = \omega_c^a{}_b E^c, \quad (2.31)$$

the first Cartan's structure equation

$$T^a = dE^a + \omega^a_b \wedge E^b \quad (2.32)$$

describes the torsion as a 2-form in terms of the vielbein basis and the second structure equation

$$R^a_b = d\omega^a_b + \omega^a_c \wedge \omega^c_b \quad (2.33)$$

allows to compute the matrix valued curvature 2-form using the connection.

The metric compatibility leads to the symmetry $\omega_{ab} = -\omega_{ba}$, which, together with the torsion free condition $T^a = 0$, uniquely determines the connection 1-form (2.31) which is nothing else than the Levi-Civita connection in the vielbein formalism

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{abc} &= \frac{1}{2}(f_{abc} - f_{bca} + f_{cab}) \\ &= -\omega_{acb}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

where

$$f_{abc} = E_a^\mu E_b^\nu (\partial_\mu E_{\nu c} - \partial_\nu E_{\mu c}) \quad (2.35)$$

are the structure functions of the vectors $E_a \in \Gamma(TM)$ defined by Eq.(1.3).

Now let us specialize to a Riemannian four-manifold M . Because the spin connection $\omega_{\mu ab}$ and the curvature tensor $R_{\mu\nu ab}$ are antisymmetric on the ab index pair, one can decompose them into a self-dual part and an anti-self-dual part as follows [5]

$$\omega_{\mu ab} = A_\mu^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i + A_\mu^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i, \quad (2.36)$$

$$R_{\mu\nu ab} = F_{\mu\nu}^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i + F_{\mu\nu}^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i \quad (2.37)$$

where the 4×4 matrices $\eta_{ab}^i \equiv \eta_{ab}^{(+i)}$ and $\bar{\eta}_{ab}^i \equiv \eta_{ab}^{(-i)}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are 't Hooft symbols defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\eta}_{jk}^i &= \eta_{jk}^i = \varepsilon_{ijk}, & j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \\ \bar{\eta}_{4j}^i &= \eta_{j4}^i = \delta_{ij}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.38}$$

Note that the 't Hooft matrices intertwine the group structure of the index i with the spacetime structure of the indices a, b . See the appendix A in [5] for some useful identities of the 't Hooft tensors.

Any $SO(4) = SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R / \mathbf{Z}_2$ rotations can be decomposed into self-dual and anti-self-dual rotations. Let us introduce two families of 4×4 matrices defined by

$$(T_+^i)_{ab} \equiv \eta_{ab}^i, \quad (T_-^i)_{ab} \equiv \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i.\tag{2.39}$$

Then one can show that T_\pm^i satisfy $SU(2)$ Lie algebras, i.e.,

$$[T_\pm^i, T_\pm^j] = -2\varepsilon^{ijk}T_\pm^k, \quad [T_\pm^i, T_\mp^j] = 0.\tag{2.40}$$

Indeed the 't Hooft tensors in (2.39) are two independent spin $s = \frac{3}{2}$ representations of $SU(2)$ Lie algebra. A deep geometric meaning of the 't Hooft tensors is to specify the triple (I, J, K) of complex structures of $\mathbf{R}^4 \cong \mathbf{C}^2$ for a given orientation as the simplest hyper-Kähler manifold. The triple complex structures (I, J, K) form a quaternion which can be identified with the $SU(2)$ generators T_\pm^i in (2.39).

Using the representation $\omega_{\mu ab}^{(\pm)} = A_\mu^{(\pm)i}(T_\pm^i)_{ab} = (A_\mu^{(\pm)})_{ab}$ in (2.36), the (anti-)self-dual curvature tensors in Eq.(2.37) can be written as the form

$$F_{\mu\nu}^{(\pm)} = \partial_\mu A_\nu^{(\pm)} - \partial_\nu A_\mu^{(\pm)} + [A_\mu^{(\pm)}, A_\nu^{(\pm)}].\tag{2.41}$$

Therefore we see that $A_\mu^{(\pm)}$ can be identified with $SU(2)_{L,R}$ gauge fields and $F_{\mu\nu}^{(\pm)}$ with their field strengths. Indeed one can also show that the local $SO(4)$ rotations with $\Lambda^a_b(y) \in SO(4)$

$$\omega_\mu \rightarrow \Lambda \omega_\mu \Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda \partial_\mu \Lambda^{-1}\tag{2.42}$$

can be represented as the gauge transformations of $SU(2)$ gauge field $A_\mu^{(\pm)}$

$$A_\mu^{(\pm)} \rightarrow \Lambda_\pm A_\mu^{(\pm)} \Lambda_\pm^{-1} + \Lambda_\pm \partial_\mu \Lambda_\pm^{-1}\tag{2.43}$$

where $\Lambda_\pm \in SU(2)_{L,R}$.⁴

⁴But Eq.(2.34) shows that the $SU(2)$ gauge fields $A_\mu^{(\pm)}$ have their own gauge fields, i.e., the vierbeins E_a whose degrees of freedom match with $U(1)$ gauge fields D_a in the action (2.22), when applying the map (1.12). Therefore it is sensible that $SU(2)$ gauge theory describing self-dual gravity can be mapped to the $U(1)$ gauge theory described by the action (2.22), as will be shown later.

Using the form language where $d = dy^\mu \partial_\mu = E^a E_a$ and $A = A_\mu dy^\mu = A_a E^a$, the field strength (2.41) of $SU(2)$ gauge fields in coordinate basis is given by

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(\pm)} &= dA^{(\pm)} + A^{(\pm)} \wedge A^{(\pm)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu}^{(\pm)} dy^\mu \wedge dy^\nu \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\partial_\mu A_\nu^{(\pm)} - \partial_\nu A_\mu^{(\pm)} + [A_\mu^{(\pm)}, A_\nu^{(\pm)}] \right) dy^\mu \wedge dy^\nu \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

or in non-coordinate basis

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(\pm)} &= \frac{1}{2} F_{ab}^{(\pm)} E^a \wedge E^b \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(E_a A_b^{(\pm)} - E_b A_a^{(\pm)} + [A_a^{(\pm)}, A_b^{(\pm)}] + f_{ab}{}^c A_c^{(\pm)} \right) E^a \wedge E^b \end{aligned} \quad (2.45)$$

where we used in (2.45) the structure equation

$$dE^a = \frac{1}{2} f_{bc}{}^a E^b \wedge E^c. \quad (2.46)$$

As we remarked, the 't Hooft tensors $\{\eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i}\}$ specify the triple of complex structures of the simplest hyper-Kähler manifold \mathbb{R}^4 satisfying the quaternion algebra. Because any Riemannian metric can be written as $g_{\mu\nu}(y) = E_\mu^a(y) E_\nu^b(y) \delta_{ab}$, one can introduce the corresponding triple of local complex structures on the Riemannian manifold M which are inherited from \mathbb{R}^4

$$J^{(\pm)i} = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} E^a \wedge E^b \quad (2.47)$$

or in terms of local coordinates

$$J^{(\pm)i} = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} E_\mu^a E_\nu^b dy^\mu \wedge dy^\nu \equiv \frac{1}{2} J_{\mu\nu}^{(\pm)i} dy^\mu \wedge dy^\nu. \quad (2.48)$$

One can easily check that the local complex structures $J^{(\pm)i}$ satisfy the quaternion algebra

$$\begin{aligned} [J^{(\pm)i}, J^{(\pm)j}]_{\mu\nu} &\equiv J_{\mu\lambda}^{(\pm)i} J^{(\pm)j\lambda}{}_\nu - J_{\mu\lambda}^{(\pm)j} J^{(\pm)i\lambda}{}_\nu \\ &= -2\varepsilon^{ijk} J_{\mu\nu}^{(\pm)k}, \\ [J^{(\pm)i}, J^{(\mp)j}]_{\mu\nu} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.49)$$

Now it is easy to see that the torsion-free condition $T^a = 0$ is equivalent to the one that the complex structures $J^{(\pm)i}$ are covariantly constant, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} dJ^{(\pm)i} &= \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} dE^a \wedge E^b - \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} E^a \wedge dE^b \\ &= -[\eta^{(\pm)i} \eta^{(\mp)j}]_{ab} A^{(\mp)j} \wedge E^a \wedge E^b + 2\varepsilon^{ijk} A^{(\pm)j} \wedge J^{(\pm)k} \\ &= 2\varepsilon^{ijk} A^{(\pm)j} \wedge J^{(\pm)k} \end{aligned} \quad (2.50)$$

where we used the fact that $[\eta^{(\pm)i}\eta^{(\mp)j}]_{ab}$ is symmetric, i.e., $[\eta^{(\pm)i}\eta^{(\mp)j}]_{ab} = [\eta^{(\pm)i}\eta^{(\mp)j}]_{ba}$. Therefore we get the relation

$$d_A J^{(\pm)i} \equiv dJ^{(\pm)i} - 2\varepsilon^{ijk} A^{(\pm)j} \wedge J^{(\pm)k} = 0. \quad (2.51)$$

All these properties can be beautifully summarized using the Palatini formalism of Einstein gravity where the spin connection and the vielbein are regarded as independent variables. The Einstein-Hilbert action in the Palatini formalism is given by

$$S_P = \frac{1}{4} \int_M \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} E^a \wedge E^b \wedge R_{cd}. \quad (2.52)$$

By varying the action (2.52) with respect to vierbein and spin connection, one can get the torsion-free condition, $T^a = dE^a + \omega^a{}_b \wedge E^b = 0$, as well as the Einstein equation, $R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ab}R = 0$, so recovering the Einstein gravity.

Using the decomposition (2.37), the Palatini action (2.52) can be recast into the beautiful form

$$\begin{aligned} S_P &= \frac{1}{4} \int_M \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} E^a \wedge E^b \wedge R_{cd} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_M \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} E^a \wedge E^b \wedge (F^{(+i)} \eta_{cd}^i + F^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{cd}^i) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_M E^a \wedge E^b \wedge (F^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i - F^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i) \\ &= \int_M (J^{(+i)} \wedge F^{(+i)} - J^{(-i)} \wedge F^{(-i)}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.53)$$

The action (2.53) immediately shows that the condition (2.51) is indeed the equations of motion for $SU(2)$ gauge fields $A^{(\pm)i}$. It is interesting to notice that the Palatini action (2.53) is invariant under a local deformation given by

$$A^{(\pm)i} \rightarrow A^{(\pm)i}, \quad J^{(\pm)i} \rightarrow J^{(\pm)i} + d_A \Lambda^{(\pm)i} \quad (2.54)$$

with an arbitrary one-form $\Lambda^{(\pm)} \in SU(2)$. The deformation symmetry (2.54) should be true due to the Bianchi identity $d_A F^{(\pm)} = 0$.

The gravitational instantons [53] are defined by the self-dual solution to the Einstein equation

$$R_{efab} = \pm \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} R_{efcd}. \quad (2.55)$$

Note that a metric satisfying the self-duality equation (2.55) is necessarily Ricci-flat because $R_{ab} = R_{acb}{}^c = \pm \frac{1}{6} \varepsilon_b{}^{cde} R_{a[cde]} = 0$ and so automatically satisfies the vacuum Einstein equations. Using the decomposition (2.37), Eq.(2.55) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{ef}^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i + F_{ef}^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i &= \pm \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} (F_{ef}^{(+i)} \eta_{cd}^i + F_{ef}^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{cd}^i) \\ &= \pm (F_{ef}^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i - F_{ef}^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i). \end{aligned} \quad (2.56)$$

Therefore we should have $F_{ab}^{(-)i} = 0$ for the self-dual case with $+$ sign in Eq.(2.55) while $F_{ab}^{(+i)} = 0$ for the anti-self-dual case with $-$ sign and so imposing the self-duality equation (2.55) is equivalent to the half-flat equation $F^{(\pm)i} = 0$. Because the Riemann curvature tensors satisfy the symmetry property

$$R_{abcd} = R_{cdab}, \quad (2.57)$$

one can rewrite the self-duality equation (2.55) as follows

$$R_{abef} = \pm \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} R_{cdef}. \quad (2.58)$$

Then, using the decomposition (2.37) again, one can similarly show [54] that the gravitational instanton (2.58) can be understood as an $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills instanton, i.e.,

$$F_{ab}^{(\pm)} = \pm \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} F_{cd}^{(\pm)} \quad (2.59)$$

where $F_{ab}^{(\pm)} = F_{ab}^{(\pm)i} T_{\pm}^i = E_a^\mu E_b^\nu F_{\mu\nu}^{(\pm)}$ are defined by Eq.(2.45).

A solution of the half-flat equation $F^{(\pm)} = 0$ is given by $A^{(\pm)} = \Lambda_{\pm} d\Lambda_{\pm}^{-1}$ and then Eq.(2.43) shows that it is always possible to choose a self-dual gauge $A^{(\pm)i} = 0$. In this gauge, Eq.(2.51) reduces to the property $dJ^{(\pm)i} = 0$, that is, the triple complex structures are all closed. In other words, there is the triple $\{J^{(\pm)i}\}$ of globally well-defined complex structures. This means that the metric $ds^2 = E^a \otimes E^a$ describes a hyper-Kähler manifold. In the end the gravitational instantons defined by (2.55) can be characterized by the following property

$$F^{(\pm)i} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad dJ^{(\pm)i} = 0, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.60)$$

In order to solve the equations (2.60), let us introduce linearly independent four vector fields V_a and a volume form ν on M . Then one can easily check [55] that the (anti-)self-dual ansatz ⁵

$$J^{(\pm)i} = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} \iota_a \iota_b \nu, \quad (2.61)$$

where ι_a denotes the inner derivation with respect to V_a , immediately solves the equations $dJ^{(\pm)i} = 0$ if and only if the vector fields satisfy the following equations [56]

$$\frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} [V_a, V_b] = 0, \quad (2.62)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{V_a} \nu = 0, \quad \forall a = 1, \dots, 4. \quad (2.63)$$

This can simply be seen by applying the formula ⁶

$$d(\iota_X \iota_Y \alpha) = \iota_{[X,Y]} \alpha + \iota_Y \mathcal{L}_X \alpha - \iota_X \mathcal{L}_Y \alpha + \iota_X \iota_Y d\alpha \quad (2.64)$$

⁵One can show that the ansatz (2.61) is equivalent to (2.47) (up to a sign) by the identification of volume form $\nu = \lambda^{-2} E^1 \wedge \dots \wedge E^4 \equiv \lambda^{-2} \nu_g$. See Eq.(2.73). According to the definition (2.61), we have $J^{(\pm)i} = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} \iota_a \iota_b (\lambda^{-2} \nu_g) = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} \iota_{\lambda E_a} \iota_{\lambda E_b} (\lambda^{-2} \nu_g) = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} \iota_{E_a} \iota_{E_b} \nu_g = \frac{1}{2} (\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{abcd} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i}) E^c \wedge E^d = \pm \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} E^a \wedge E^b$.

⁶This formula can be easily derived by applying the Cartan's homotopy formula $\mathcal{L}_X \beta = \iota_X d\beta + d\iota_X \beta$ for $\beta = \iota_Y \alpha$ and $[\mathcal{L}_X, \iota_Y] = \iota_{[X,Y]}$ [6].

for vector fields X, Y and a p -form α .

Now go back to the action (2.22) and consider the self-duality equation of $U(1)$ gauge fields defined by

$$\widehat{F}_{ab} = \pm \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} \widehat{F}_{cd}. \quad (2.65)$$

Note that the self-duality equation (2.65) is nonlinear due to the Poisson commutator term in (2.23) and so there exist nontrivial solutions [34]. After quantization (1.7), they are precisely noncommutative $U(1)$ instantons [57]. One can translate the self-duality equation (2.65) to the self-duality equation between vector fields according to the map (2.27):

$$\widehat{F}_{ab} = \pm \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} \widehat{F}_{cd} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad [V_a, V_b] = \pm \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ab}{}^{cd} [V_c, V_d]. \quad (2.66)$$

Recall that the vector fields V_a are all divergence-free, i.e., $\partial_\mu V_a^\mu = 0$, in other words, $\mathcal{L}_{V_a} \nu = 0$. Therefore we see that the self-duality equation (2.65) for gauge fields is certainly equivalent to the equations (2.62) and (2.63). In conclusion, we finally proved [2, 3, 4, 5] the equivalence between $U(1)$ instantons defined by Eq.(2.65) and gravitational instantons defined by Eq.(2.55).

2.3 Einstein gravity from electromagnetism on symplectic manifold

As a warm-up we have illustrated with self-dual gauge fields how the Darboux theorem in symplectic geometry implements a deep principle to realize a Riemannian manifold as an emergent geometry from gauge fields on a symplectic manifold through the correspondence (1.12) whose metric is given by

$$ds^2 = \delta_{ab} E^a \otimes E^b = \lambda^2 \delta_{ab} V_\mu^a V_\nu^b dy^\mu \otimes dy^\nu \quad (2.67)$$

where $E^a = \lambda V^a \in \Gamma(T^*M)$ are dual one-forms. Now we will generalize the emergent gravity to arbitrary gauge fields on a $2n$ -dimensional symplectic manifold (M, B) and derive Einstein equations from (2.29) and (2.30).

First let us determine what $\lambda \in C^\infty(M)$ in Eq.(2.67) is. Introduce the structure equation of the vector fields $V_a = \lambda E_a \in \Gamma(TM)$

$$[V_a, V_b] = -\mathbf{f}_{ab}{}^c V_c. \quad (2.68)$$

By comparing with (1.3), one can get the relation between the two structure functions

$$\mathbf{f}_{ab}{}^c = \lambda f_{ab}{}^c - V_a \log \lambda \delta_b^c + V_b \log \lambda \delta_a^c. \quad (2.69)$$

Using the definition (2.68), the self-duality equation (2.66) may be written as the compact form

$$\eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} \mathbf{f}_{ab}{}^c = 0. \quad (2.70)$$

Suppose that the $2n$ -dimensional volume form whose four-dimensional example was introduced in (2.61) is given by

$$\nu = \lambda^2 V^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge V^{2n}, \quad (2.71)$$

in other words,

$$\lambda^2 = \nu(V_1, \dots, V_{2n}). \quad (2.72)$$

The volume form (2.71) can be related to the Riemannian one $\nu_g = E^1 \wedge \dots \wedge E^{2n}$ as

$$\nu = \lambda^{2-2n} \nu_g. \quad (2.73)$$

Acting \mathcal{L}_{V_a} on both sides of Eq.(2.72), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{V_a} \left(\nu(V_1, \dots, V_{2n}) \right) &= (\mathcal{L}_{V_a} \nu)(V_1, \dots, V_{2n}) + \sum_{b=1}^{2n} \nu(V_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{V_a} V_b, \dots, V_{2n}) \\ &= (\mathcal{L}_{V_a} \nu)(V_1, \dots, V_{2n}) + \sum_{b=1}^{2n} \nu(V_1, \dots, [V_a, V_b], \dots, V_{2n}) \\ &= (\nabla \cdot V_a + \mathbf{f}_{ba}{}^b) \nu(V_1, \dots, V_{2n}) \\ &= (2V_a \log \lambda) \nu(V_1, \dots, V_{2n}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.74)$$

Because $\mathcal{L}_{V_a} \nu = (\nabla \cdot V_a) \nu = 0$, Eq.(2.74) leads to the relation

$$\rho_a \equiv \mathbf{f}_{ba}{}^b = 2V_a \log \lambda \quad (2.75)$$

and then, from Eq.(2.69),

$$f_{ba}{}^b = (3 - 2n) E_a \log \lambda. \quad (2.76)$$

Conversely, if $\mathbf{f}_{ba}{}^b = 2V_a \log \lambda$, the vector fields V_a preserve the volume form ν , i.e., $\mathcal{L}_{V_a} \nu = (\nabla \cdot V_a) \nu = 0$, $\forall a = 1, \dots, 2n$. Eq.(2.76) implies that the vector fields E_a preserve the volume form $\tilde{\nu} = \lambda^{3-2n} \nu_g$, which can be proved as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{E_a} (\lambda^{3-2n} \nu_g) = d(\iota_{E_a} (\lambda^{3-2n} \nu_g)) = d(\iota_{\lambda E_a} (\lambda^{2-2n} \nu_g)) = d(\iota_{V_a} \nu) = \mathcal{L}_{V_a} \nu = 0. \quad (2.77)$$

In a non-coordinate (anholonomic) basis $\{E_a\}$ satisfying the commutation relation (1.3), the spin connections are defined by

$$\nabla_a E_c = \omega_a{}^b{}_c E_b \quad (2.78)$$

where $\nabla_a \equiv \nabla_{E_a}$ is the covariant derivative in the direction of a vector field E_a . Acting on the dual basis $\{E^a\}$, they are given by

$$\nabla_a E^b = -\omega_a{}^b{}_c E^c. \quad (2.79)$$

Because we will impose the torsion free condition, i.e.,

$$T(a, b) = \nabla_{[a} E_{b]} - [E_a, E_b] = 0, \quad (2.80)$$

the spin connections are related to the structure functions

$$f_{abc} = -\omega_{acb} + \omega_{bca}. \quad (2.81)$$

The Riemann curvature tensors in the basis $\{E_a\}$ are defined by

$$R(a, b) = [\nabla_a, \nabla_b] - \nabla_{[a, b]} \quad (2.82)$$

or in component form

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ab}{}^c{}_d &= \langle E^c, R(E_a, E_b)E_d \rangle \\ &= E_a \omega_b{}^c{}_d - E_b \omega_a{}^c{}_d + \omega_a{}^c{}_e \omega_b{}^e{}_d - \omega_b{}^c{}_e \omega_a{}^e{}_d + f_{ab}{}^e \omega_e{}^c{}_d. \end{aligned} \quad (2.83)$$

Imposing the condition that the metric (2.67) is covariantly constant, i.e.,

$$\nabla_c (\delta_{ab} E^a \otimes E^b) = 0, \quad (2.84)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\omega_{cab} = -\omega_{cba}, \quad (2.85)$$

the spin connections ω_{cab} then have the same number of components as f_{abc} . Thus Eq.(2.81) has a unique solution and it is precisely given by Eq.(2.34). The definition (2.82) together with the metricity condition (2.85) immediately leads to the following symmetry property

$$R_{abcd} = -R_{abdc} = -R_{bacd}. \quad (2.86)$$

Using the relation (2.69), the spin connections in Eq.(2.34) are now determined by gauge theory bases

$$\lambda \omega_{abc} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{f}_{abc} - \mathbf{f}_{bca} + \mathbf{f}_{cab}) - V_b \log \lambda \delta_{ca} + V_c \log \lambda \delta_{ab}. \quad (2.87)$$

The spacetime geometry described by the metric (2.67) is an emergent gravity arising from gauge fields whose underlying theory is defined by the action (2.22). The fundamental variables in our approach are of course gauge fields which are subject to the equations (2.29) and (2.30). A spacetime metric is now regarded as a collective variable defined by a composite or bilinear of gauge fields. Therefore we are going to a viable realization of the idea we speculated around Eq.(1.2) if it is possible to show that the equations of motion (2.30) for gauge fields together with the Bianchi identity (2.29) can be rewritten as the Einstein equations for the metric (2.67). For this purpose we first want to represent the Riemann curvature tensors in Eq.(2.83), originally expressed with the orthonormal basis E_a , in terms of the gauge theory basis V_a . That representation will be useful because we will eventually impose on them Eqs.(2.29) and (2.30).

Indeed everything is prepared because all calculations can straightforwardly be done using the relations (2.69) and (2.87). All the details can be found in [5]. Here we will briefly sketch essential steps.

One can easily derive the following identity

$$\begin{aligned} &R(E_a, E_b)E_c + R(E_b, E_c)E_a + R(E_c, E_a)E_b \\ &= [E_a, [E_b, E_c]] + [E_b, [E_c, E_a]] + [E_c, [E_a, E_b]] \end{aligned} \quad (2.88)$$

using the torsion free condition (2.80). The Jacobi identity then immediately derives $R_{[abc]d} = 0$. Because $V_a = \lambda E_a$, we have the relation

$$[V_a, [V_b, V_c]] = \lambda^3 [E_a, [E_b, E_c]], \quad (2.89)$$

where all the terms containing the derivations of λ cancel each other. As we promised, the first Bianchi identity $R_{[abc]d} = 0$ follows from the Jacobi identity (2.29). Thus we pleasingly confirm that

$$\widehat{D}_{[a} \widehat{F}_{bc]} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad R_{[abc]d} = 0. \quad (2.90)$$

The Bianchi identity (2.90) together with Eq.(2.86) leads to the symmetry (2.57). It may be emphasized that the equivalence (2.90) holds for arbitrary gauge fields in any even dimensions.

From the above derivation, we have to notice that, if torsion free condition (2.80) were not imposed, the equivalence (2.90) could be corrected. This can be seen from the Bianchi identities [1]

$$DT^a \equiv dT^a + \omega^a_b \wedge T^b = R^a_b \wedge E^b, \quad (2.91)$$

$$DR^a_b \equiv dR^a_b + \omega^a_c \wedge R^c_b - R^a_c \wedge \omega^c_b = 0, \quad (2.92)$$

which are integrability conditions derived from (2.32) and (2.33). In general the equivalence (2.90) holds only if $DT^d = 0$ where $R_c^d \wedge E^c = \frac{1}{2} R_{abc}^d E^a \wedge E^b \wedge E^c = \frac{1}{6} R_{[abc]}^d E^a \wedge E^b \wedge E^c = 0$. Note that Eq.(2.29) is simply the consequence of the Jacobi identity for the Poisson bracket (1.6), which should be true for a general Poisson structure (not necessarily nondegenerate) as long as the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket $[\theta, \theta]_{SN} \in \Gamma(\wedge^3 TM)$ vanishes. Thus Eq.(2.29) will still be true for a generic Poisson manifold. And one may get the relation $R_{[abc]}^d - D_{[a} T_{bc]}^d = 0$ instead from (2.89) for a nonzero torsion. Nevertheless, we conjecture that the torsion will identically vanish even for a general Poisson manifold because the existence of a Poisson structure implies the equivalence principle in the theory of emergent gravity.

The mission for the equations of motion (2.30) is more nontrivial. After some technical manipulation, a remarkably simple form for the Ricci tensor can be obtained in four dimensions [5]:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ab} = & -\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left[\mathbf{f}_d^{(+i)} \eta_{ac}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{bc}^j + \mathbf{f}_d^{(+i)} \eta_{bc}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{ac}^j \right. \\ & \left. - (\mathbf{f}_c^{(+i)} \eta_{ac}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{bd}^j + \mathbf{f}_c^{(+i)} \eta_{bc}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{ad}^j) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.93)$$

Remember that the Ricci tensor (2.93) is defined on-shell, i.e., the equations of motion (2.30) as well as the Bianchi identity (2.29) were already imposed in the course of derivation. Here we also decomposed \mathbf{f}_{abc} into self-dual and anti-self-dual parts as in Eq.(2.36)

$$\mathbf{f}_{abc} = \mathbf{f}_c^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i + \mathbf{f}_c^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i \quad (2.94)$$

where

$$\mathbf{f}_c^{(\pm i)} \eta_{ab}^{(\pm i)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{f}_{abc} \pm \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ab}^{de} \mathbf{f}_{dec} \right). \quad (2.95)$$

For later use, let us also introduce a completely antisymmetric tensor defined by

$$\Psi_{abc} \equiv \mathbf{f}_{abc} + \mathbf{f}_{bca} + \mathbf{f}_{cab} \equiv \varepsilon_{abcd} \Psi_d. \quad (2.96)$$

Using the decomposition (2.94), one can easily see that

$$\Psi_a = -\frac{1}{3!} \varepsilon_{abcd} \Psi_{bcd} = -\left(\mathbf{f}_b^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i - \mathbf{f}_b^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i \right), \quad (2.97)$$

while Eq.(2.75) leads to

$$\rho_a = \mathbf{f}_{bab} = -\left(\mathbf{f}_b^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i + \mathbf{f}_b^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i \right). \quad (2.98)$$

Note that the right-hand side of Eq.(2.93) is purely interaction terms between the self-dual and anti-self-dual parts in Eq.(2.94). Therefore, if gauge fields satisfy the self-duality equation (2.70), i.e. $\mathbf{f}_a^{(\pm)i} = 0$, they describe a Ricci-flat manifold, i.e., $R_{ab} = 0$. Of course, this result is completely consistent with the previous self-dual case.

The next step is to calculate the Einstein tensor to identify the form of energy-momentum tensor

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ab} &= R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab} R \\ &= -\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left(\mathbf{f}_d^{(+i)} \eta_{ac}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{bc}^j + \mathbf{f}_d^{(+i)} \eta_{bc}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{ac}^j \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left(\mathbf{f}_c^{(+i)} \eta_{ac}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{bd}^j + \mathbf{f}_c^{(+i)} \eta_{bc}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{ad}^j - \delta_{ab} \mathbf{f}_d^{(+i)} \eta_{cd}^i \mathbf{f}_e^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{ce}^j \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.99)$$

where the Ricci scalar R is given by

$$R = \frac{2}{\lambda^2} \mathbf{f}_b^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i \mathbf{f}_c^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{ac}^j. \quad (2.100)$$

We have adopted the conventional view that the gravitational field is represented by the spacetime metric itself. The problem thus becomes one of finding field equations to relate the metric (2.67) to the energy-momentum distribution. According to our scheme, Eq.(2.99) therefore corresponds to such field equations, i.e., the Einstein equations. First, notice that the right-hand side of Eq.(2.99) identically vanishes for self-dual gauge fields, satisfying $\mathbf{f}_a^{(\pm)i} = 0$, whose energy-momentum tensor also identically vanishes because their action is topological, i.e., metric independent. But, for general gauge fields for which $\mathbf{f}_a^{(\pm)i} \neq 0$, the right-hand side of Eq.(2.99) no longer vanishes, which in turn enforces $E_{ab} = R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab} R \neq 0$. Because the Einstein tensor E_{ab} equals some energy-momentum tensor for matter fields, the non-vanishing Einstein tensor implies that there is a nontrivial energy-momentum tensor coming from $U(1)$ gauge fields. In other words, the presence of $U(1)$ gauge fields on a symplectic spacetime not only deforms spacetime geometry according to the correspondence (1.12) but also plays a role of matter fields contributing to the energy-momentum tensor. Indeed it should be the case because the action (2.22) reduces to the ordinary Maxwell theory in commutative limit and so has a nontrivial energy-momentum tensor. Therefore, it is natural to identify the right-hand side of Eq.(2.99) with some energy-momentum tensor determined by $U(1)$ gauge fields.

We intentionally make the following separation into two kinds of energy-momentum tensors denoted by $T_{ab}^{(M)}$ and $T_{ab}^{(L)}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{ab}^{(M)} &= -\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left(\mathbf{f}_d^{(+i)} \eta_{ac}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{bc}^j + \mathbf{f}_d^{(+i)} \eta_{bc}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{ac}^j \right), \\
&= -\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \mathbf{f}_d^{(+i)} \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \left(\eta_{ac}^i \bar{\eta}_{bc}^j + \eta_{bc}^i \bar{\eta}_{ac}^j \right), \\
&= -\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left(\mathbf{f}_{acd} \mathbf{f}_{bcd} - \frac{1}{4} \delta_{ab} \mathbf{f}_{cde} \mathbf{f}_{cde} \right), \tag{2.101}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{ab}^{(L)} &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left(\mathbf{f}_c^{(+i)} \eta_{ac}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{bd}^j + \mathbf{f}_c^{(+i)} \eta_{bc}^i \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{ad}^j - \delta_{ab} \mathbf{f}_d^{(+i)} \eta_{cd}^i \mathbf{f}_e^{(-j)} \bar{\eta}_{ce}^j \right), \\
&= \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \mathbf{f}_c^{(+i)} \mathbf{f}_d^{(-j)} \left(\eta_{ac}^i \bar{\eta}_{bd}^j + \eta_{bc}^i \bar{\eta}_{ad}^j - \delta_{ab} \eta_{ec}^i \bar{\eta}_{ed}^j \right), \\
&= \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} \left(\rho_a \rho_b - \Psi_a \Psi_b - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab} (\rho_c^2 - \Psi_c^2) \right) \tag{2.102}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the decomposition (2.95) and the relation

$$\mathbf{f}_b^{(+i)} \eta_{ab}^i = -\frac{1}{2} (\rho_a + \Psi_a), \quad \mathbf{f}_b^{(-i)} \bar{\eta}_{ab}^i = -\frac{1}{2} (\rho_a - \Psi_a).$$

With this notation, the Einstein equations (2.99) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{ab} &= R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab} R \\
&= \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} \left(T_{ab}^{(M)} + T_{ab}^{(L)} \right). \tag{2.103}
\end{aligned}$$

The main motivation of the above separation was originated by the fact that the energy-momentum tensor $T_{ab}^{(M)}$ is traceless, i.e., $T_{aa}^{(M)} = 0$, because of the property $\eta_{ab}^{(\pm)i} \eta_{ab}^{(\mp)j} = 0$ and so the Ricci scalar (2.100) is determined by the second energy-momentum tensor $T_{ab}^{(L)}$ only.

First let us identify the real character of the energy-momentum tensor (2.101). When one stares at the energy-momentum tensor in (2.101), one may find that it is very reminiscent of the Maxwell energy-momentum tensor given by

$$T_{ab}^{(em)} = \frac{\hbar^2 c^2}{g_{YM}^2} \left(F_{ac} F_{bc} - \frac{1}{4} \delta_{ab} F_{cd} F_{cd} \right), \tag{2.104}$$

which is also traceless, i.e., $T_{aa}^{(em)} = 0$. Indeed it was argued in [5] that the energy-momentum tensor (2.101) can be mapped to (2.104) by reversely applying the map (1.12), so to speak, by translating the map $\Gamma(TM) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$.⁷

There is another reason why the energy-momentum tensor (2.101) could be mapped to Eq.(2.104). Consider a commutative limit where $|\theta|^2 \equiv \widehat{g}_{ac} \widehat{g}_{bd} \theta^{ab} \theta^{cd} = \kappa^2 |\kappa B g^{-1}|^2 \rightarrow 0$. In this limit we should

⁷There was a perverse sign problem in reversing the map. We still don't understand how to properly translate the map $\Gamma(TM) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ to avoid the sign problem. In a way, one may consider some analytic continuation such that every modules are defined over \mathbb{C} , as was suggested in [5]. Anyway the sign issue will be insignificant at this stage.

recover the ordinary Maxwell theory from the action (2.22) which may be more obvious from the left-hand side of Eq.(2.14). Because the action (2.22) is defined in the commutative limit which reduces to the Maxwell theory at $|\theta| = 0$, the Maxwell theory should play a role in the Einstein equation (2.103). Of course it would be most natural if it appears in the right-hand side of the Einstein equation (2.103) as an energy-momentum tensor, as we explained above.

If so, it is still necessary to understand how the gravitational constant G in (2.103) arose from the gauge theory (2.22) because it did not contain G from the outset. Recall that both (2.103) and (2.104) are valid even in D -dimensions. Because the energy-momentum tensor carries the physical dimension of energy density, i.e., $[T_{ab}^{(em)}] = \frac{ML^2T^{-2}}{L^{D-1}}$ and $[R_{ab}] = L^{-2}$, we need some physical constant carrying the physical dimension of $M^{-1}L^{D-1}T^{-2}$ in the form of Eq.(2.103). Of course, it is the Newton constant G . See Eq.(1.14). But we remarked that, if a field theory is equipped with an intrinsic length scale, which is precisely the case of the action (2.22) with $L^2 = |\theta|$, the gravitational constant G can arise purely from the field theory. In our case, it means [5] that the gravitational constant G can be determined by the field theory parameters only in Eq.(2.22):

$$\frac{G\hbar^2}{c^2} \sim g_{YM}^2 |\theta|. \quad (2.105)$$

We will postpone to next section to pose an important question on what the physical implications of Eq.(2.105) are, because we are not so prepared for that question so far.

Now it is in order to ask the real character of the energy-momentum tensor (2.102). As we pointed out before, $T_{ab}^{(M)}$ in (2.101) is traceless and so the Ricci scalar (2.100) should genuinely be determined by the second energy-momentum tensor (2.102). For example, let us consider a maximally symmetric space in which the curvature and Ricci tensors are given by

$$R_{abcd} = \frac{R}{D(D-1)}(\delta_{ac}\delta_{bd} - \delta_{ad}\delta_{bc}), \quad R_{ab} = \frac{R}{D}\delta_{ab}. \quad (2.106)$$

So let us simply assume that the Einstein equations (2.103) allow a nearly maximally symmetric spacetime. In this case, the energy-momentum tensor (2.102) will be dominant and the global structure of spacetime will be determined by $T_{ab}^{(L)}$ only.

To descry more close aspects of the energy-momentum tensor (2.102), let us consider the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_a \rho_b &= \frac{1}{4} \delta_{ab} \rho_c^2 + \left(\rho_a \rho_b - \frac{1}{4} \delta_{ab} \rho_c^2 \right), \\ \Psi_a \Psi_b &= \frac{1}{4} \delta_{ab} \Psi_c^2 + \left(\Psi_a \Psi_b - \frac{1}{4} \delta_{ab} \Psi_c^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.107)$$

In the above decomposition, the first terms correspond to scalar modes and will be a source of the expansion/contraction of spacetime while the second terms correspond to quadruple modes and will give rise to the shear distortion of spacetime, which can be seen via the Raychauduri's equation (5.13). For a nearly maximally symmetric spacetime, the second terms can thus be neglected. In this case

the energy-momentum tensor (2.102) behaves like a cosmological constant for a (nearly) constant curvature spacetime, i.e.,

$$T_{ab}^{(L)} = -\frac{c^4 R}{32\pi G} \delta_{ab}. \quad (2.108)$$

In Section 5, we will consider the Wick rotation, $y^4 = iy^0$, of the energy-momentum tensor (2.102) and discuss a very surprising aspect of it in Minkowski signature.

3 Quantum Gravity

Riemannian geometry has been charged with a primary role in describing the theory of gravity. But many astronomical phenomena involved with very strongly gravitating systems, e.g., the Big-Bang, black holes, etc., disclose that the Riemannian geometry describing a smooth spacetime manifold is not enough. Instead it turns out that a “quantum geometry” is necessary to describe such extremely gravitating systems. Unfortunately we still don’t know how to quantize a Riemannian manifold in order to define the quantum geometry.

In the previous section we showed that a Riemannian geometry can be emergent from a Poisson geometry in the context of emergent gravity. The underlying Poisson geometry has been defined by the $U(1)$ gauge theory on a Poisson spacetime. Therefore we may quantize the Poisson geometry to define quantum gravity. Now we want to explore how the Poisson geometry defined by the $U(1)$ gauge theory on the Poisson spacetime could be quantized to describe quantum geometries.

3.1 Quantum equivalence principle

In the first section we have suggested that the quantization of gravity might be defined by the space-time deformation in terms of G rather than \hbar . If spin-two graviton were really a fundamental particle, it could be physically viable to quantize gravity in terms of the Planck constant \hbar which will quantize the particle phase space of gravitons. But recent developments in string theory [9], especially, known as the AdS/CFT duality, open-closed string duality, matrix models, etc, imply that gravity may be a collective phenomenon emergent from gauge fields. That is, the spin-two graviton might arise as a composite of two spin-one gauge bosons. Amusingly this composite nature of gravitons is already inherent in the vielbein formalism as the metric expression (1.2) politely insinuates.

In the second section we showed that Einstein gravity can be formulated in terms of symplectic geometry rather than Riemannian geometry in the context of emergent gravity. An essential step for emergent gravity was to realize the equivalence principle, the most important property in the theory of gravity (general relativity), from $U(1)$ gauge theory on a symplectic or Poisson manifold. Through the realization of the equivalence principle which is an intrinsic property in the symplectic geometry [6] known as the Darboux theorem or the Moser lemma, we could understand how diffeomorphism

symmetry arises from symplectic $U(1)$ gauge theory and so gravity can emerge from the symplectic electromagnetism, which is also an interacting theory.

A unique feature of gravity disparate from other physical interactions is that it is characterized by the Newton constant G whose physical dimension is of $(\text{length})^2$ in the natural unit. We have to deeply ruminare about its physical origin. Our proposal was that it is inherited from a Poisson structure of spacetime. In order to support it, we have elucidated how gravity can be emergent from a field theory on such a spacetime, so-called, a symplectic or, more generally, Poisson manifold. Also we have realized such an idea in (2.105) that the gravitational constant G can be purely determined by gauge theory parameters, signaling the emergence of gravity from the field theory. Remarkably it turned out that $U(1)$ gauge theory defined with an intrinsic length scale set by the Poisson structure (1.6) should be a theory of gravity.

Therefore it is now obvious how to quantize gravity if gravity is emergent from a gauge theory defined on a symplectic or Poisson manifold. We already briefly speculated in subsection 1.3 how quantum geometry can arise from the quantization of spacetime, i.e., noncommutative spacetime. We will more clarify how the essential properties of emergent gravity can be lifted to the noncommutative spacetime. In particular, we want to clarify how the Darboux theorem as the equivalence principle for emergent gravity can be realized in a full noncommutative geometry. It was already convincingly argued in [3] that such kind of “quantum equivalence principle” exists in the context of deformation quantization *à la* Kontsevich as a gauge equivalence between star products. Actually this gauge equivalence between star products reduces in commutative limit to the usual Darboux theorem and was the basis of the Seiberg-Witten map between commutative and noncommutative gauge fields [10], as was also discussed in [3]. Therefore, a general noncommutative deformation of emergent gravity would be possible because Kontsevich already proved [12] that any Poisson manifold can always be quantized at least in the context of deformation quantization.

As we argued in the second section, the Darboux theorem or more precisely the Moser lemma in symplectic geometry is enough to derive Einstein gravity because the latter arises from $U(1)$ gauge theory on a symplectic manifold. Now we want to quantize the $U(1)$ gauge theory defined by the action (2.22) *à la* Dirac, i.e., by adopting the quantization rule (1.7):

$$\begin{aligned} D_a \in C^\infty(M) &\rightarrow \hat{D}_a = B_{ab}y^b + \hat{A}_a \in \mathcal{A}_\theta, \\ \{D_a, D_b\}_\theta &\rightarrow -i[\hat{D}_a, \hat{D}_b] \equiv -B_{ab} + \hat{F}_{ab}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $\hat{F}_{ab} \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$ is the noncommutative field strength defined by

$$\hat{F}_{ab} = \partial_a \hat{A}_b - \partial_b \hat{A}_a - i[\hat{A}_a, \hat{A}_b]. \quad (3.2)$$

Here we will understand the noncommutative fields in (3.1) as self-adjoint operators acting on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Then we get the $U(1)$ gauge theory defined on the noncommutative spacetime (1.8)

$$\hat{S} = -\frac{1}{4G_s} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} [\hat{D}_a, \hat{D}_b] [\hat{D}^a, \hat{D}^b], \quad (3.3)$$

where $G_s \equiv g_s/2\pi\kappa^2$ and the trace $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is defined over the Fock space (1.18) and can be identified with

$$\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \equiv \int \frac{d^{2n}y}{(2\pi)^n |\text{Pf}\theta|}. \quad (3.4)$$

The Jacobi identity for the operator algebra \mathcal{A}_θ leads to the Bianchi identity

$$[\hat{D}_{[a}, [\hat{D}_b, \hat{D}_{c]}]] = -\hat{D}_{[a} \hat{F}_{bc]} = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

and the equations of motion derived from the action (3.3) reads as

$$[\hat{D}^a, [\hat{D}_a, \hat{D}_b]] = -\hat{D}^a \hat{F}_{ab} = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$\hat{D}_a \hat{F}_{bc} = \partial_a \hat{F}_{bc} - i[\hat{A}_a, \hat{F}_{bc}]. \quad (3.7)$$

In classical mechanics, the set of possible states of a particle system forms a Poisson manifold P . The observables that we want to measure are smooth functions in $C^\infty(P)$, forming a commutative (Poisson) algebra. In quantum mechanics, the set of possible states is represented by a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . The observables are self-adjoint operators acting on \mathcal{H} , forming a noncommutative \star -algebra. The change from a Poisson manifold to a Hilbert space is a pretty big one.

A natural question is whether the quantization such as Eq.(1.7) for a spacetime manifold M with a general Poisson structure $\pi = \frac{1}{2}\pi^{\mu\nu}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \in \bigwedge^2 TM$ is always possible with a radical change in the nature of the observables. The problem is how to construct the Hilbert space for a general Poisson manifold, which is in general highly nontrivial. Deformation quantization was proposed in [58] as an alternative, where the quantization is understood as a deformation of the algebra $\mathcal{A} = C^\infty(M)$ of classical observables. Instead of building a Hilbert space from a Poisson manifold and associating an algebra of operators to it, we are only concerned with the algebra \mathcal{A} to deform the commutative product in $C^\infty(M)$ to a noncommutative and associative product. In a canonical phase space where $\pi = \theta$ such as the case we have considered so far, it is easy to show that the two approaches have one-to-one correspondence through the Weyl-Moyal map [7, 8]:

$$\hat{f} \cdot \hat{g} \cong (f \star g)(y) = \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}\theta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu^y \partial_\nu^z\right) f(y)g(z) \Big|_{y=z}. \quad (3.8)$$

Recently M. Kontsevich answered the above question in the context of deformation quantization [12]. He proved that every finite-dimensional Poisson manifold M admits a canonical deformation quantization and that changing coordinates leads to gauge equivalent star products. We briefly recapitulate his results which will be useful for our later discussions.

Let \mathcal{A} be the algebra over \mathbb{R} of smooth functions on a finite-dimensional C^∞ -manifold M . A star product on \mathcal{A} is an associative $\mathbb{R}[[\hbar]]$ -bilinear product on the algebra $\mathcal{A}[[\hbar]]$, a formal power series in

\hbar with coefficients in $C^\infty(M) = \mathcal{A}$, given by the following formula for $f, g \in \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}[[\hbar]]$:⁸

$$(f, g) \mapsto f \star g = fg + \hbar B_1(f, g) + \hbar^2 B_2(f, g) + \cdots \in \mathcal{A}[[\hbar]] \quad (3.9)$$

where $B_i(f, g)$ are bidifferential operators. There is a natural gauge group which acts on star products. This group consists of automorphisms of $\mathcal{A}[[\hbar]]$ considered as an $\mathbf{R}[[\hbar]]$ -module (i.e. linear transformations $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ parameterized by \hbar). If $D(\hbar) = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} \hbar^n D_n$ is such an automorphism where $D_n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ are differential operators, it acts on the set of star products as

$$\star \rightarrow \star', \quad f(\hbar) \star' g(\hbar) = D(\hbar) \left(D(\hbar)^{-1}(f(\hbar)) \star D(\hbar)^{-1}(g(\hbar)) \right) \quad (3.10)$$

for $f(\hbar), g(\hbar) \in \mathcal{A}[[\hbar]]$. This is evident from the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}[[\hbar]] \times \mathcal{A}[[\hbar]] & \xrightarrow{\star} & \mathcal{A}[[\hbar]] \\ \downarrow D(\hbar) \times D(\hbar) & & \downarrow D(\hbar) \\ \mathcal{A}[[\hbar]] \times \mathcal{A}[[\hbar]] & \xrightarrow{\star'} & \mathcal{A}[[\hbar]] \end{array}$$

Two star products \star and \star' are called equivalent if there exists an automorphism $D(\hbar)$, a formal power series of differential operators, satisfying Eq.(3.10). We are interested in star products up to the gauge equivalence. This equivalence relation is closely related to the cohomological Hochschild complex of algebra \mathcal{A} [12], i.e. the algebra of smooth polyvector fields on M . For example, it follows from the associativity of the product (3.9) that the symmetric part of B_1 can be killed by a gauge transformation which is a coboundary in the Hochschild complex, and that the antisymmetric part of B_1 , denoted as B_1^- , comes from a bivector field $\pi \in \Gamma(\Lambda^2 TM)$ on M :

$$B_1^-(f, g) = \langle \pi, df \otimes dg \rangle. \quad (3.11)$$

In fact, any Hochschild coboundary can be removed by a gauge transformation $D(\hbar)$, so leading to the gauge equivalent star product (3.10). The associativity at $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$ further constrains that π must be a Poisson structure on M , in other words, $[\pi, \pi]_{SN} = 0$, where the bracket is the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket on polyvector fields (see Ref. [12] for the definition of this bracket and the Hochschild cohomology). Thus, gauge equivalence classes of star products modulo $\mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$ are classified by Poisson structures on M . It was shown [12] that there are no other obstructions to deforming the algebra \mathcal{A} up to arbitrary higher orders in \hbar .

For an equivalence class of star products for any Poisson manifold, Kontsevich arrived at the following general result [12]:

⁸Here \hbar is a formal deformation parameter which may be identified with either $|\theta|$ or the Planck constant \hbar , depending on the choice of a Poisson manifold P or M . For the Poisson manifold M with the Poisson structure $\theta \in \bigwedge^2 TM$, it would be convenient to take the rescaling $\theta^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \hbar \theta^{\mu\nu}$ because \hbar is regarded as a plain parameter without any indices. In the end, one may set $\hbar = 1$.

The set of gauge equivalence classes of star products on a smooth manifold M can be naturally identified with the set of equivalence classes of Poisson structures depending formally on \hbar

$$\pi = \pi(\hbar) = \pi_1 \hbar + \pi_2 \hbar^2 + \cdots \in \Gamma(\Lambda^2 TM)[[\hbar]], \quad [\pi, \pi]_{SN} = 0 \in \Gamma(\Lambda^3 TM)[[\hbar]] \quad (3.12)$$

modulo the action of the group of formal paths in the diffeomorphism group of M , starting at the identity diffeomorphism. And, if we change coordinates in Eq.(3.9), we obtain a gauge equivalent star product.

The above theorem means that the set of equivalence classes of associative algebras close to algebras of functions on manifolds is in one-to-one correspondence with the set of equivalence classes of Poisson manifolds module diffeomorphisms.

Suppose that the Poisson tensor $\pi = \frac{1}{2}\pi^{\mu\nu}(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \in \bigwedge^2 TM$ is a nondegenerate constant bi-vector and denote it with θ again. In this case the star product is given by Eq.(3.8), the so-called Moyal product. If we make an arbitrary change of coordinates, $y^\mu \mapsto x^a(y)$, in the Moyal \star -product (3.8), which is nothing but the Kontsevich's star product (3.9) with the constant Poisson bi-vector θ , we will get a new star product (3.9) defined by a Poisson bi-vector $\pi(\hbar)$. But the resulting star product has to be gauge equivalent to the Moyal product (3.8) and $\pi(\hbar)$ belongs to the same equivalence class of Poisson structures and so could be determined by a formal power series (3.12) of the original Poisson bi-vector θ . Conversely, if two star products \star and \star' are gauge equivalent in the sense that there exists an automorphism $D(\hbar)$ satisfying (3.10), the Poisson structures θ and π defining the star products \star and \star' , respectively, must belong to the same gauge equivalence class. This is the general statement of the above theorem.

Actually it is easy to show that the gauge equivalence relation (3.10) between star products reduces to the Darboux transformation (2.7) in commutative limit where $D(\hbar) = 1$. After identifying $\pi^{-1} = B + F$ and $\theta^{-1} = B$, we get in this limit

$$\{x^a, x^b\}_\theta(y) = \theta^{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial x^a}{\partial y^\mu} \frac{\partial x^b}{\partial y^\nu} = \pi^{ab}(x) = \left(\frac{1}{B + F} \right)^{ab}(x), \quad (3.13)$$

which is precisely the inverse of Eq.(2.7) if $\omega_1 = \pi^{-1}$ and $\omega_0 = \theta^{-1}$.

Therefore we propose [3] the “quantum equivalence principle” as the gauge equivalence (3.10) between star products in the sense that the Darboux theorem as the equivalence principle for emergent gravity is lifted to noncommutative geometry. Furthermore the isomorphism (2.12) from the Lie algebra of Poisson vector fields to the Lie algebra of vector fields as derivations of $C^\infty(M)$ can be lifted to the noncommutative spacetime (1.8) as follows. Consider an adjoint operation of noncommutative gauge fields $\widehat{D}_a(y) \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$ in (3.1)

$$\widehat{V}_a[\widehat{f}](y) \equiv -i[\widehat{D}_a(y), \widehat{f}(y)]_\star. \quad (3.14)$$

The leading term in Eq.(3.14) exactly recovers the vector fields in Eq.(1.12), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{V}_a[\widehat{f}](y) &= -i[\widehat{D}_a(y), \widehat{f}(y)]_\star = -\theta^{\mu\nu} \frac{\partial D_a(y)}{\partial y^\nu} \frac{\partial f(y)}{\partial y^\mu} + \cdots \\ &= V_a[f](y) + \mathcal{O}(\theta^3). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Because the star product (3.9) is associative, one can show the following properties

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{V}_a[\widehat{f} \star \widehat{g}] &= \widehat{V}_a[\widehat{f}] \star \widehat{g} + \widehat{f} \star \widehat{V}_a[\widehat{g}], \\ \widehat{V}_{i[\widehat{D}_a, \widehat{D}_a]_\star} &= [\widehat{V}_a, \widehat{V}_b]_\star.\end{aligned}\tag{3.16}$$

The above property implies that we can identify the adjoint operation $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_\theta) \equiv \{\widehat{V}_a | a = 1, \dots, 2n\}$ with the (inner) derivations of noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ and so the generalization of vector fields $\Gamma(TM) = \{V_a | a = 1, \dots, 2n\}$ in Eq.(1.12). Using Eq.(3.16), one can show that

$$\widehat{V}_{\widehat{F}_{ab}} = [\widehat{V}_a, \widehat{V}_b]_\star, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\widehat{V}_{\widehat{D}_a \widehat{F}_{bc}} = [\widehat{V}_a, [\widehat{V}_b, \widehat{V}_c]_\star]_\star, \tag{3.18}$$

which may be compared with (2.27) and (2.28). We can use the map (3.18) in the exactly same way as the Poisson algebra case to translate the Jacobi identity (3.5) and the equations of motion (3.6) into some relations between the generalized vector fields \widehat{V}_a defined by (3.14) [5]:

$$\widehat{D}_{[a} \widehat{F}_{bc]} = 0 \Leftrightarrow [\widehat{V}_{[a}, [\widehat{V}_b, \widehat{V}_c]_\star]_\star = 0, \tag{3.19}$$

$$\widehat{D}^a \widehat{F}_{ab} = 0 \Leftrightarrow [\widehat{V}^a, [\widehat{V}_a, \widehat{V}_b]_\star]_\star = 0. \tag{3.20}$$

We will consider the system of the derivations of noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ defined by (3.19) and (3.20) as the quantization of the system given by (2.29) and (2.30) and so *the quantization of Einstein gravity* in the sense of Eq.(1.7). To support the claim, we will take the correspondence (1.22) to show [4] that any large N gauge theory can be mapped to a noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory like as (3.3). Because the large N gauge theory is believed to provide a theory of quantum geometries as evidenced by the AdS/CFT correspondence and various matrix models in string theory, we think it could be a reasonable evidence for our claim.

3.2 Noncommutative electromagnetism as a large N gauge theory

Let us consider $U(N \rightarrow \infty)$ Yang-Mills theory in d dimensions

$$S_M = -\frac{1}{G_s} \int d^d z \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} D_\mu \Phi^a D^\mu \Phi^a - \frac{1}{4} [\Phi^a, \Phi^b]^2 \right), \tag{3.21}$$

where $G_s \equiv 2\pi g_s / (2\pi\kappa)^{\frac{4-d}{2}}$ and Φ^a ($a = 1, \dots, 2n$) are adjoint scalar fields in $U(N)$. Here the d -dimensional commutative spacetime \mathbf{R}_C^d will be taken with either Lorentzian or Euclidean signature. Note that, if $d = 4$ and $n = 3$, the action (3.21) is exactly the bosonic part of 4-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theory, which is the large N gauge theory of the AdS/CFT correspondence.

Suppose that a vacuum of the theory (3.21) is given by

$$\langle \Phi^a \rangle_{\text{vac}} = \frac{1}{\kappa} y^a, \quad \langle A_\mu \rangle_{\text{vac}} = 0. \tag{3.22}$$

We will assume that the vacuum expectation values $y^a \in U(N)$ in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit satisfy the algebra

$$[y^a, y^b] = i\theta^{ab}\mathbf{1}_{N \times N}, \quad (3.23)$$

where θ^{ab} is a constant matrix of rank $2n$. If so, the vacuum (3.22) is definitely a solution of the theory (3.21) and the large N matrices y^a can be mapped to noncommutative fields according to the correspondence (1.22). The adjoint scalar fields in vacuum then satisfy the noncommutative Moyal algebra defined by (1.8) or equivalently

$$[y^a, y^b]_\star = i\theta^{ab}. \quad (3.24)$$

Now let us expand large N matrices in the action (3.21) around the vacuum (3.22)

$$\Phi^a(z, y) = \frac{1}{\kappa}(y^a + \theta^{ab}\hat{A}_b(z, y)), \quad (3.25)$$

$$D_\mu(z, y) = \partial_\mu - i\hat{A}_\mu(z, y), \quad (3.26)$$

where we assumed that the fluctuations $\hat{A}_M(X) \equiv (\hat{A}_\mu, \hat{A}_a)(z, y)$, $M = 1, \dots, d + 2n$, also depend on the vacuum moduli in (3.22). Therefore let us introduce $D = d + 2n$ -dimensional coordinates $X^M = (z^\mu, y^a)$ which consist of d -dimensional commutative ones, denoted by z^μ ($\mu = 1, \dots, d$), and $2n$ -dimensional noncommutative ones, denoted by y^a ($a = 1, \dots, 2n$), satisfying the relation (3.24). Likewise, D -dimensional gauge fields $\hat{A}_M(X)$ are also introduced in a similar way⁹

$$\begin{aligned} D_M(X) &= \partial_M - i\hat{A}_M(X) \\ &\equiv (D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i\hat{A}_\mu, D_a = -i\kappa B_{ab}\Phi^b)(z, y). \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

According to the correspondence (1.22), we will replace the matrix commutator in the action (3.21) by the star commutator, i.e.,

$$[\clubsuit, \spadesuit]_{N \times N} \rightarrow [\clubsuit, \spadesuit]_\star. \quad (3.28)$$

It is then straightforward to calculate each component in the matrix action (3.21)

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mu\nu} &= i[D_\mu, D_\nu]_\star = \partial_\mu \hat{A}_\nu - \partial_\nu \hat{A}_\mu - i[\hat{A}_\mu, \hat{A}_\nu]_\star := \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}, \\ D_\mu \Phi^a &= i \frac{\theta^{ab}}{\kappa} [D_\mu, D_b]_\star = \frac{\theta^{ab}}{\kappa} (\partial_\mu \hat{A}_b - \partial_b \hat{A}_\mu - i[\hat{A}_\mu, \hat{A}_b]_\star) := \frac{\theta^{ab}}{\kappa} \hat{F}_{\mu b}, \\ [\Phi^a, \Phi^b] &= -\frac{1}{\kappa^2} \theta^{ac} \theta^{bd} [D_c, D_d]_\star = \frac{i}{\kappa^2} \theta^{ac} \theta^{bd} (-B_{cd} + \partial_c \hat{A}_d - \partial_d \hat{A}_c - i[\hat{A}_c, \hat{A}_d]_\star) \\ &:= -\frac{i}{\kappa^2} (\theta(\hat{F} - B)\theta)^{ab}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

⁹Our notation here may be sloppy. D_a in (3.27) contain an extra $-i$ compared to (3.1). This sloppy notation is for the parallel march with D_μ .

where we defined $[\partial_\mu, \hat{f}]_\star = \partial_\mu \hat{f}$ and $B = \frac{1}{2} B_{ab} dy^a \wedge dy^b$ with $\text{rank}(B) = 2n$. It is important to notice that large N matrices in the vacuum (3.22) are now represented by their master fields which are higher dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge fields in (3.27) whose field strength is given by

$$\hat{F}_{MN} = \partial_M \hat{A}_N - \partial_N \hat{A}_M - i[\hat{A}_M, \hat{A}_N]_\star. \quad (3.30)$$

Collecting all the results in (3.29) and also using the trace (3.4), the action (3.21) can be recast into the simple form [4]

$$\hat{S}_B = -\frac{1}{4g_{YM}^2} \int d^D X \sqrt{-G} G^{MP} G^{NQ} (\hat{F}_{MN} - B_{MN}) \star (\hat{F}_{PQ} - B_{PQ}), \quad (3.31)$$

where we assumed the constant metric on $\mathbf{R}^D = \mathbf{R}_C^d \times \mathbf{R}_{NC}^{2n}$ as the following form

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= G_{MN} dX^M dX^N \\ &= g_{\mu\nu} dz^\mu dz^\nu + \hat{g}_{ab} dy^a dy^b \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

and the relations in (2.16), (2.17) and (2.18) were used. In the end the d -dimensional $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theory (3.21) has been transformed into a D -dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory.

Depending on the choice of base space \mathbf{R}_C^d , one can get a series of matrix models from the large N gauge theory (3.21). For instance, the IKKT matrix model for $d = 0$ [14], the BFSS matrix model for $d = 1$ [13] and the matrix string theory for $d = 2$ [15]. The most interesting case is of $d = 4$ and $n = 3$ that is equal to the bosonic part of 4-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theory in the AdS/CFT duality [18] and is equivalent to the 10-dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory on $\mathbf{R}_C^4 \times \mathbf{R}_{NC}^6$. Note that all these matrix models or large N gauge theories are a nonperturbative formulation of string or M theories. Therefore it would be reasonable to expect that the d -dimensional $U(N \rightarrow \infty)$ gauge theory (3.21) and so the D -dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory (3.31) describe a theory of quantum gravity, according to the large N duality or AdS/CFT correspondence.

We will give further evidences why the matrix action (3.21) contains a variety of quantum geometries and how smooth Riemannian geometries can be emergent from the action (3.31) in commutative limit. First apply the adjoint operation (3.14) to the D -dimensional noncommutative gauge fields $D_A(X) = (D_\mu, D_a)(z, y)$ (after switching the index $M \rightarrow A$ to distinguish from local coordinate indices M, N, \dots)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_A[\hat{f}](X) &= [D_A, \hat{f}]_\star(z, y) \\ &\equiv V_A^M(z, y) \partial_M f(z, y) + \mathcal{O}(\theta^3), \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

where $V_A^\mu = \delta_A^\mu$ because the star product acts only on y -coordinates and we define $[\partial_\mu, \hat{f}(X)]_\star = \frac{\partial \hat{f}(X)}{\partial z^\mu}$. More explicitly, the D -dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge fields at the leading order appear as the usual vector fields (frames in tangent bundle) on a D -dimensional manifold M given by

$$V_A(X) = (\partial_\mu + A_\mu^a \partial_a, D_a^b \partial_b) \quad (3.34)$$

or with matrix notation

$$V_A^M(X) = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_\mu^\nu & A_\mu^a \\ 0 & D_a^b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.35)$$

where

$$A_\mu^a \equiv -\theta^{ab} \frac{\partial \hat{A}_\mu}{\partial y^b}, \quad D_a^b \equiv \delta_a^b - \theta^{bc} \frac{\partial \hat{A}_a}{\partial y^c}. \quad (3.36)$$

One can easily check that V_A 's in Eq.(3.34) take values in the Lie algebra of volume-preserving vector fields, i.e., $\partial_M V_A^M = 0$. One can also determine the dual basis $V^A = V_M^A dX^M \in \Gamma(T^*M)$, i.e., $\langle V^A, V_B \rangle = \delta_B^A$, which is given by

$$V^A(X) = (dz^\mu, V_b^a(dy^b - A_\mu^b dz^\mu)) \quad (3.37)$$

or with matrix notation

$$V_M^A(X) = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_\mu^\nu & -V_b^a A_\mu^b \\ 0 & V_b^a \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.38)$$

where $V_a^c D_c^b = \delta_a^b$.

From the previous analysis in Section 2.3 (which corresponds to $d = 0$ case), we know that the vector fields V_A determined by gauge fields are related to the orthonormal frames (vielbeins) E_A by $V_A = \lambda E_A$ and so $E^A = \lambda V^A$ where the conformal factor λ will be determined later. (This situation is very reminiscent of the string frame (V_A) and the Einstein frame (E_A) in string theory.) Hence the D -dimensional metric can be determined explicitly by the dual basis (3.37) up to a conformal factor [59]

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \eta_{AB} E^A \otimes E^B \\ &= \lambda^2 \eta_{AB} V^A \otimes V^B = \lambda^2 \eta_{AB} V_M^A V_N^B dX^M \otimes dX^N \\ &= \lambda^2 \left(\eta_{\mu\nu} dz^\mu dz^\nu + \delta_{ab} V_c^a V_d^b (dy^c - \mathbf{A}^c)(dy^d - \mathbf{A}^d) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

where $\mathbf{A}^a = A_\mu^a dz^\mu$.

The conformal factor λ^2 in the metric (3.39) can be determined in exactly the same way as the Section 2.3. Choose a D -dimensional volume form with a matching parameter $\lambda \in C^\infty(M)$ such that

$$\nu = \lambda^2 V^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge V^D \quad (3.40)$$

and so

$$\lambda^2 = \nu(V_1, \dots, V_D). \quad (3.41)$$

Then the vector fields V_A are volume preserving with respect to a D -dimensional volume form $\nu = \lambda^{(2-D)} \nu_g$ where

$$\nu_g = E^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge E^D \quad (3.42)$$

and the vector fields E_A are volume preserving with respect to another volume form $\tilde{\nu} = \lambda^{(3-D)}\nu_g$. Because $\partial_M V_A^M = 0$ or $\mathcal{L}_{V_A}\nu = 0$, we can choose the invariant volume by turning off all fluctuations in (3.40) as

$$\nu = dz^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^d \wedge dy^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dy^{2n}. \quad (3.43)$$

Then we finally get

$$\lambda^2 = \det^{-1} V_b^a. \quad (3.44)$$

One can see that the spacetime geometry described by the metric (3.39) is completely determined by noncommutative gauge fields whose underlying theory is defined by the action (3.21) or (3.31). One may also confirm the claim in Section 1.1 that a spin-two graviton arises as a composite of two spin-one vector fields and such spin-one vector fields arise from electromagnetic fields living in the noncommutative spacetime (3.24). But one has to remember that the spacetime geometry (3.39) is responsible only for the leading order, i.e., $\mathcal{O}(\theta)$, of the generalized vector fields defined by (3.33). All higher derivative terms in the star product in Eq.(3.33) are simply ignored. If such higher derivative terms are included in the star product in (3.33) order by order, they will deform the Einstein gravity order by order as a response of noncommutative effects of spacetime. (See Ref.[3] for higher order corrections to emergent gravity.) If a probe goes into a deep microscopic world where the noncommutative effect of spacetime will grow significantly, the gravity description (3.39) in terms of smooth geometries will gradually become crude and coarse. In the deep noncommutative space, we have to replace Einstein gravity by a more fundamental theory describing quantum gravity or noncommutative geometry. We argued that such a fundamental theory could be implemented by the large N gauge theory (3.21) or the higher dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory (3.31).

First note that

$$[D_A, D_B]_\star = -i(\hat{F}_{AB} - B_{AB}), \quad (3.45)$$

$$[D_A, [D_B, D_C]_\star]_\star = -i\hat{D}_A \hat{F}_{BC}, \quad (3.46)$$

where

$$\hat{D}_A \hat{F}_{BC} \equiv \partial_A \hat{F}_{BC} - i[\hat{D}_A, \hat{F}_{BC}]_\star. \quad (3.47)$$

Therefore the Bianchi identity and the equations of motion for the action (3.31) can be written as

$$\hat{D}_{[A} \hat{F}_{BC]} = i[D_{[A}, [D_B, D_C]_\star]_\star = 0, \quad (3.48)$$

$$\hat{D}^A \hat{F}_{AB} = i[D^A, [D_A, D_B]_\star]_\star = 0. \quad (3.49)$$

Then the above equations can be translated into some “geometric” equations of generalized vector fields defined in (3.33):

$$\hat{D}_{[A} \hat{F}_{BC]} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad [\hat{V}_{[A}, [\hat{V}_B, \hat{V}_C]_\star]_\star = 0, \quad (3.50)$$

$$\hat{D}^A \hat{F}_{AB} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad [\hat{V}^A, [\hat{V}_A, \hat{V}_B]_\star]_\star = 0. \quad (3.51)$$

It may be useful to introduce a noncommutative version of the structure equation (2.68)

$$[\widehat{V}_A, \widehat{V}_B]_\star = -\widehat{\mathfrak{F}}_{AB}{}^C \widehat{V}_C, \quad (3.52)$$

with the ordering prescription that the structure coefficients $\widehat{\mathfrak{F}}_{AB}{}^C \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$ are always coming to the left-hand side. The equations (3.50) and (3.51) can be rewritten using the structure equation (3.52) as

$$\widehat{D}_{[A} \widehat{F}_{BC]} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \widehat{V}_{[A} \widehat{\mathfrak{F}}_{BC]}{}^D - \widehat{\mathfrak{F}}_{[BC}{}^E \widehat{\mathfrak{F}}_{A]E}{}^D = 0, \quad (3.53)$$

$$\widehat{D}^A \widehat{F}_{AB} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \eta^{AB} \left(\widehat{V}_A \widehat{\mathfrak{F}}_{BC}{}^D - \widehat{\mathfrak{F}}_{BC}{}^E \widehat{\mathfrak{F}}_{AE}{}^D \right) = 0. \quad (3.54)$$

Take a commutative limit $|\theta| \rightarrow 0$ (in the same sense as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in quantum mechanics) and keep only the leading term in Eq.(3.33) for the generalized vector fields \widehat{V}_A . In this limit we will recover the Einstein gravity for the emergent metric (3.39) where (3.53) and (3.54) reduce to the first Bianchi identity for Riemann tensors and the Einstein equations, respectively, as we checked in the previous section. The Einstein gravity is relevant only in this limit. If $|\theta|$ is finite (in the same sense as $\hbar \rightarrow 1$ in quantum mechanics), we have to ask to (3.53) and (3.54) instead; What's going on there ?

In order to answer the question, it is necessary to solve the equations (3.53) and (3.54) first. Of course, it will be in general very difficult to solve the equations. Instead one may introduce linear algebraic conditions of D -dimensional field strengths \widehat{F}_{AB} as a higher dimensional analogue of 4-dimensional self-duality equations such that the Yang-Mills equations in the action (3.31) follow automatically. These are of the following type [60]

$$\frac{1}{2} T_{ABCD} \widehat{F}_{CD} = \chi \widehat{F}_{AB} \quad (3.55)$$

with a constant 4-form tensor T_{ABCD} . The relation (3.55) clearly implies via the Bianchi identity (3.50) that the equations of motion (3.51) are satisfied provided χ is nonzero. For $D > 4$, the 4-form tensor T_{ABCD} cannot be invariant under $SO(D)$ transformations and the equation (3.55) breaks the rotational symmetry to a subgroup $H \subset SO(D)$. Thus the resulting first order equations can be classified by the unbroken symmetry H under which T_{ABCD} remain invariant [60]. It was also shown [61] that the first order linear equations above are closely related to supersymmetric states, i.e., BPS states in higher dimensional Yang-Mills theories.

Note that

$$\widehat{V}_{[D_A, D_B]} = -i \widehat{V}_{\widehat{F}_{AB}} = [\widehat{V}_A, \widehat{V}_B]_\star. \quad (3.56)$$

Using the homomorphism (3.56), one can translate the generalized self-duality equation (3.55) into the structure equation between vector fields

$$\frac{1}{2} T_{ABCD} \widehat{F}_{CD} = \chi \widehat{F}_{AB} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{1}{2} T_{ABCD} [\widehat{V}_C, \widehat{V}_D]_\star = \chi [\widehat{V}_A, \widehat{V}_B]_\star. \quad (3.57)$$

Therefore a D -dimensional noncommutative gauge field configuration satisfying the first-order system defined by the left-hand side of (3.57) is isomorphic to a D -dimensional emergent “quantum”

geometry defined by the right-hand side of (3.57) whose metric in commutative limit is given by (3.39). For example, in four dimensions where $T_{ABCD} = \varepsilon_{ABCD}$ and $\chi = \pm 1$, Eq.(3.57) goes to (2.66) describing gravitational instantons in the commutative limit. Hence it will not be absurd if someone claims that self-dual noncommutative electromagnetism in four dimensions is equivalent to self-dual quantum gravity [2, 34]. Indeed it was argued in [4] that the emergent geometry arising from the self-dual system (3.57) is closely related to the bubbling geometry in AdS space found in [29].

3.3 Background independent quantum gravity

According to Einstein, the gravity is the dynamics of spacetime geometry. Therefore, as emphasized by Elvang and Polchinski [62], the emergence of gravity necessarily requires the emergence of spacetime itself. That is, spacetime is not given *a priori* but should be derived from fundamental ingredients in quantum gravity theory, say, “spacetime atoms”. But, for consistency, the entire spacetime including a flat spacetime must be emergent. In other words, the emergent gravity should necessarily be “background independent” where any spacetime structure is not *a priori* assumed but defined by the theory. Furthermore, if spacetime is emergent, then all fields supported on this spacetime must be emergent too. The question is how everything including spacetime, gauge fields and matter fields could be emergent collectively. We know emergent phenomena in condensed matters arise due to a very coherent condensation in vacuum. So, in order to realize all these emergent phenomena, the emergent spacetime needs to be derived from an extremely coherent vacuum, which is the lesson we learned from the condensed matters. It turns out to be the case if a flat spacetime is emergent from a noncommutative algebra such as quantum harmonic oscillators.

We will carefully recapitulate the emergent gravity derived from the action (3.21) to throw the universe into a fresh perspective and to elucidate how the emergent gravity based on the noncommutative geometry achieves the background independence. Of course, real physics is necessarily background dependent because a physical phenomenon occurs in a particular background with specific initial conditions. The background independence here means that, although physical events occur in a particular (spacetime and material) background, an underlying theory itself describing such a physical event should not presuppose any kind of spacetime as well as material backgrounds. The background in itself should also arise from a solution of the underlying theory.

The $U(N)$ gauge theory (3.21) is defined by a collection of $N \times N$ matrices $(A_\mu, \Phi^a)(z)$ on a d -dimensional flat spacetime \mathbb{R}_C^d . Note that the d -dimensional flat spacetime \mathbb{R}_C^d already exists from the beginning independently of $U(N)$ gauge fields and the theory says nothing about its origin. It just serves as a playground for the players (A_μ, Φ^a) .

We showed that the d -dimensional matrix theory (3.21) in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit and in a particular background can be mapped to the $D = d + 2n$ -dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory. The resulting higher-dimensional $U(1)$ gauge theory has been transformed to a theory of higher-dimensional gravity describing a dynamical spacetime geometry according to the isomorphism be-

tween the noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ and the algebra $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_\theta)$ of vector fields. Look at the metric (3.39). Definitely the extra $2n$ -dimensional spacetime was emergent and takes part in the spacetime geometry. It was not an existent spacetime background in the action (3.21) at the outset. But the theory says that it was originated from the vacuum (3.22). One can easily check this fact by turning off all fluctuations in the metric (3.39). The D -dimensional flat spacetime is coming from the vacuum configuration (3.22) whose vector field is given by $V_A^{(\text{vac})} = (\partial_\mu, \partial_a)$ according to Eq.(3.33). Furthermore the vacuum is a solution of the theory (3.21). Therefore the underlying theory (3.21) by itself entirely describes the emergence of the $2n$ -dimensional space and its dynamical fluctuations.

Also note that the original d -dimensional spacetime is now dynamical, not a playground any more, although the original flat spacetime part \mathbf{R}_C^d was assumed *a priori* in the theory. One can see that the existence of nontrivial gauge field fluctuations $A_\mu(z)$ causes the curving of \mathbf{R}_C^d . Therefore the large N gauge theory (3.21) almost provides a background independent description of spacetime geometry except the original background \mathbf{R}_C^d .

Now a question is how to achieve a complete background independence about emergent geometry. An answer is simple. We may completely remove the spacetime \mathbf{R}_C^d from the action (3.21) and start with a theory without spacetime from the beginning. It is well-known in matrix models how to do this operation. This change of dimensionality appears in the matrix theory as the ‘matrix T-duality’ (see Sec. VI.A in [16]) defined by

$$iD_\mu = i\partial_\mu + A_\mu \rightleftharpoons \Phi^a. \quad (3.58)$$

Applying the matrix T-duality (3.58) to the action (3.21), on one hand, one can arrive at the 0-dimensional IKKT matrix model [14] in the case of Euclidean signature

$$S_{IKKT} = -\frac{2\pi}{g_s\kappa^2} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{4} [X^M, X^N] [X_M, X_N] \right) \quad (3.59)$$

where $X^M = \kappa\Phi^M$, or the 1-dimensional BFSS matrix model [13] in the case of Lorentzian signature

$$S_{BFSS} = -\frac{1}{G_s} \int dt \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{2} D_0 \Phi^a D^0 \Phi^a - \frac{1}{4} [\Phi^a, \Phi^b]^2 \right). \quad (3.60)$$

On the other hand, one can also go up to D -dimensional pure $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theory given by

$$S_C = -\frac{1}{4g_{YM}^2} \int d^D X \text{Tr} F_{MN} F^{MN}. \quad (3.61)$$

Note that the B -field is completely disappeared, i.e., the spacetime is commutative. In fact the T-duality between the theories defined by (3.31) and (3.61) is an analogue of the Morita equivalence on a noncommutative torus stating that noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory with rational $\theta = M/N$ is equivalent to an ordinary $U(N)$ gauge theory [10].

Let us focus on the IKKT matrix model (3.59) because it is completely background independent because it is 0-dimensional. In order to define the action (3.59), it is not necessary to assume the

prior existence of any spacetime structure. There are only a bunch of $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices X^M ($M = 1, \dots, D$) which are subject to a couple of algebraic relations given by

$$[X^M, [X^N, X^P]] + [X^N, [X^P, X^M]] + [X^P, [X^M, X^N]] = 0, \quad (3.62)$$

$$[X_M, [X^M, X^N]] = 0. \quad (3.63)$$

Suppose that a vacuum of the theory (3.59) in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit is given by

$$[X^M, X^N] = i\theta^{MN} \mathbf{1}_{N \times N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i\theta^{ab} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{N \times N} \quad (3.64)$$

where θ^{ab} is a constant matrix of rank $2n$. In exactly the same way as the case (3.21), one can map the $N \times N$ matrices $X^M = (X^\mu, X^a)$ into noncommutative fields according to the correspondence (1.22)

$$(X^\mu, X^a)_{N \times N} \mapsto \kappa \left(\widehat{\Phi}^\mu(y), \frac{i}{\kappa} \theta^{ab} \widehat{D}_b(y) \right) \in \mathcal{A}_\theta \quad (3.65)$$

where $\widehat{D}_a(y) \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$ is given by (3.1). It is then straightforward to get a $2n$ -dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory from the matrix action (3.59)

$$\widehat{S} = \frac{1}{g_{YM}^2} \int d^{2n}y \sqrt{\widehat{g}} \left(\frac{1}{4} \widehat{g}^{ac} \widehat{g}^{bd} (\widehat{F}_{ab} - B_{ab}) \star (\widehat{F}_{cd} - B_{cd}) + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{g}^{ab} \widehat{D}_a \widehat{\Phi}^\mu \star \widehat{D}_b \widehat{\Phi}^\mu - \frac{1}{4} [\widehat{\Phi}^\mu, \widehat{\Phi}^\nu]_\star^2 \right), \quad (3.66)$$

where g_{YM}^2 and the metric \widehat{g}^{ab} are defined by (2.16), (2.17) and (2.18). If θ^{MN} in (3.64) is a constant matrix of rank $D = d + 2n$ instead, we will get a D -dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory whose action is basically the same as Eq.(3.31) except that it comes with Euclidean signature and a constant B -field of rank D .

In summary, we have scanned both $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theories and noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theories in various dimensions and different B -field backgrounds by applying the matrix T-duality (3.58) and the correspondence (1.22). From the derivation of Eq.(3.31), one may notice that the rank of B -field is equal to the dimension of emergent space, which is also equal to the number of adjoint scalar fields $\Phi^a \in U(N)$. Therefore the matrix theory (3.21) can be defined in different dimensions by changing the rank of B -field if the dimension D was fixed, e.g., $D = 10$. On the other hand, we can change the dimensionality of the theory (3.66) by changing the rank of θ in (3.64). In this way we can connect every $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theories and noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theories in various dimensions by changing the B -field background and applying the matrix T-duality (3.58) and the correspondence (1.22). It is really remarkable !

But there is also a caveat. One can change the dimensionality of matrix model by any integer number by the matrix T-duality (3.58) while the rank of B -field can be changed only by an even number because it is supposed to be symplectic. Hence it is not obvious what kind of background can explain a noncommutative field theory with an odd number of adjoint Higgs fields. A plausible guess is that either the vacuum is described by a noncommutative space induced by a Poisson structure, e.g.,

of Lie algebra type, i.e., $[X^a, X^b] = if^{ab}_c X^c$, or there is a 3-form $C_{\mu\nu\rho}$ which reduces to the 2-form B in Eq.(2.16) by a circle compactification, so may be of M-theory origin. We will briefly discuss the Lie algebra case later but, unfortunately, we don't know much about how to construct a corresponding noncommutative field theory with the 3-form background. We leave it as a future problem.

Some critical aspect of quantum geometry may be met with the following question. What is the emergent geometry derived from the noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory (3.66)? One may naively apply the map (3.33) to the noncommutative fields $(\hat{\Phi}^\mu(y), \hat{D}_a(y)) \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$. The fields $\hat{D}_a(y)$ have no problem because they are exactly the same as (3.1). But the fields $\hat{\Phi}^\mu(y)$ leads to a bizarre circumstance. From the map (3.33), we may intend to define

$$\begin{aligned} i[\hat{\Phi}^\mu(y), \hat{f}(y)]_\star &= \theta^{ab} \frac{\partial \Phi^\mu(y)}{\partial y^b} \partial_a f(y) + \dots \\ \text{"} \equiv \text{"} & V^{\mu a}(y) \partial_a f(y) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.67)$$

But we immediately get into trouble if we remember that the fields $\hat{\Phi}^\mu(y)$ are purely fluctuations and so the 'fake' vector fields $V^\mu = V^{\mu a}(y) \partial_a$ are not invertible in general. For example, they tend to vanish at $|y| \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that a Riemannian metric should be nondegenerate, i.e., invertible everywhere. This is not the case for V^μ . Therefore the fields $\hat{\Phi}^\mu(y)$ is not yet available as a classical geometry although they could define a "bubbling quantum geometry". This notable difference between $\hat{\Phi}^\mu(y)$ and $\hat{D}_a(y)$ is due to the fact that $\hat{D}_a(y)$ define fluctuations around the uniform vacuum condensation (3.22) while $\hat{\Phi}^\mu(y)$ define pure fluctuations around "nothing", say, without any coherent condensation in vacuum.

Therefore we get a very important picture from the above analysis.

In order to describe a classical geometry from a background independent theory such as (3.59), it is necessary to have a nontrivial vacuum defined by a "coherent" condensation of gauge fields, e.g., the vacuum defined by (3.22).

Here the "coherent" means that a spacetime vacuum is defined by the Heisenberg algebra such as quantum harmonic oscillators like (1.17). Its physical significance will be discussed later.

Also note that a symplectic structure $B_{ab} \equiv (\theta^{-1})_{ab}$ is nowhere vanishing, which can be regarded as a field strength of noncommutative gauge fields $A_a^{(0)} \equiv \langle \hat{A}_a^{(0)} \rangle_{\text{vac}} = -B_{ab} y^b$. In terms of physicist language, this means that there is an (inhomogeneous in general) condensation of gauge fields in vacuum, i.e.,

$$\langle B_{ab}(x) \rangle_{\text{vac}} = \theta_{ab}^{-1}(x). \quad (3.68)$$

For a constant symplectic structure for simplicity, it will be suggestive to rewrite the covariant vectors in (3.1) as (actually to invoke a renowned Goldstone boson $\varphi = \langle \varphi \rangle + h$)¹⁰

$$\hat{D}_a(y) = -\langle \hat{A}_a^{(0)} \rangle_{\text{vac}} + \hat{A}_a(y). \quad (3.69)$$

¹⁰In this respect, it would be interesting to quote a recent comment of A. Zee [63]: "The basic equation for the graviton field has the same form $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$. This naturally suggests that $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \langle g_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ and perhaps some sort of spontaneous symmetry breaking." It turns out [3, 5] that this pattern is not an accidental happening.

This naturally suggests some sort of spontaneous symmetry breaking [3] where y^a are vacuum expectation values of $\widehat{D}_a(y)$, specifying the background (3.68) as usual, and $\widehat{A}_b(y)$ are fluctuating (dynamical) coordinates (fields).

We thus arrived at another important point.

The origin of spacetime symplectic or Poisson structure such as (1.6) or (1.17) is coming from the coherent condensation of gauge fields in vacuum.

3.4 General noncommutative spacetime

So far we have mostly considered noncommutative spaces defined by a canonical symplectic structure. Here we will explain how it is possible to generalize emergent gravity to a general noncommutative spacetime, for example, to the case with a nonconstant symplectic structure or a generic Poisson structure. General results are beyond our reach up to now. So we will be brief about this subject. Readers may skip this part and might attack the emergent gravity for a general noncommutative spacetime in the near future after more understanding about simple cases has been done.

The question is how to generalize the emergent gravity picture to the case of a nontrivial vacuum, e.g., (3.68), describing an inhomogeneous condensate of gauge fields. The Poisson structure $\Theta^{ab}(x) = (\frac{1}{B})^{ab}(x)$ is nonconstant in this case, so the corresponding noncommutative field theory is defined by a nontrivial star-product

$$[Y^a, Y^b]_{\star'} = i\Theta^{ab}(Y) \quad (3.70)$$

where Y^a denote vacuum coordinates which are designed with the capital letters to distinguish them from y^a for the constant vacuum (1.17). The star product $[\widehat{f}, \widehat{g}]_{\star'}$ for $\widehat{f}, \widehat{g} \in \mathcal{A}_\Theta$ can be perturbatively computed via the deformation quantization [12]. There are excellent earlier works [64] especially relevant for the analysis of the DBI action as a generalized geometry though a concrete formulation of noncommutative field theories for a general noncommutative spacetime is still out of reach.

We will mostly focus on the commutative limit so that

$$\begin{aligned} -i[\widehat{f}, \widehat{g}]_{\star'} &= \Theta^{ab}(Y) \frac{\partial f(Y)}{\partial Y^a} \frac{\partial g(Y)}{\partial Y^b} + \dots \\ &\equiv \{f, g\}_\Theta + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.71)$$

for $\widehat{f}, \widehat{g} \in \mathcal{A}_\Theta$. Using the Poisson bracket (3.71), we can similarly realize the Lie algebra homomorphism $C^\infty(M) \rightarrow TM : f \mapsto X_f$ between a Hamiltonian function f and the corresponding Hamiltonian vector field X_f . To be specific, for any given function $f \in C^\infty(M)$, we can always assign a Hamiltonian vector field X_f defined by $X_f(g) = \{g, f\}_\Theta$ with some function $g \in C^\infty(M)$. Then the following Lie algebra homomorphism holds

$$X_{\{f, g\}_\Theta} = -[X_f, X_g] \quad (3.72)$$

as long as the Jacobi identity for the Poisson bracket $\{f, g\}_\Theta(x)$ holds or, equivalently, the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket (3.93) for the Poisson structure Θ^{ab} vanishes.

As we discussed in (3.10), there is a natural automorphism $D(\hbar)$ which acts on star-products [12]. In commutative limit where $D(\hbar) \approx 1$, we can deduce the following relation from (3.10)

$$\{f, g\}_\Theta = \{f, g\}_\theta. \quad (3.73)$$

Let us explain what Eq.(3.73) means. For $f = Y^a(y)$ and $g = Y^b(y)$, Eq.(3.73) implies that

$$\Theta^{ab}(Y) = \theta^{cd} \frac{\partial Y^a}{\partial y^c} \frac{\partial Y^b}{\partial y^d} \quad (3.74)$$

whose statement is, of course, equivalent to the Darboux transformation (2.7). Also notice that Eq.(3.73) defines diffeomorphisms between vector fields $X'_f(g) \equiv \{g, f\}_\Theta$ and $X_f(g) \equiv \{g, f\}_\theta$ such that

$$X'^a_f = \frac{\partial Y^a}{\partial y^b} X^b_f. \quad (3.75)$$

Indeed the automorphism (3.10) corresponds to a global statement that the two star-products involved are cohomologically equivalent in the sense that they generate the same Hochschild cohomology [12].

In order to understand the origin of the nontrivial star product (3.70), let us look at the background independent action (3.59). As we pointed out, a particular vacuum such as (3.68) should be defined by the theory itself as a solution of the equations of motion (3.63). Of course, there are infinitely many solutions. The constant background (3.64) is just one of them. So let us consider another background

$$[X^M, X^N] = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i(\theta - \theta \hat{F})^{ab} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{N \times N}. \quad (3.76)$$

Using the property (3.73), one can infer that the above background (3.76) gets equivalent to (3.70) by the identification $X^a := Y^a = y^a + \theta^{ab} \hat{A}_b(y)$ and $\Theta^{ab}(y) = (\theta - \theta \hat{F}(y))^{ab}$. If $\hat{F}_{ab}(y)$ simply satisfy Eq.(3.55) which provides a very ample class of solutions, the background (3.76) is a consistent solution of the theory (3.59). For example, the vacuum (3.76) in four dimensions ($n = 2$) corresponds to the noncommutative instanton background. In this case the vacuum manifold determined by background gauge fields is a hyper-Kähler manifold.

Therefore we may understand the nontrivial star product (3.70) results from an inhomogeneous condensation of gauge fields on the constant vacuum (3.64). This observation can be applied to the identity (2.14) in a very interesting way. Let us decompose the nontrivial B-field in (3.68) as

$$B_{ab}(x) = (\bar{B} + \bar{F}(x))_{ab} \quad (3.77)$$

where $\bar{B}_{ab} = (\theta^{-1})_{ab}$ describes a constant background such as (1.17) while $\bar{F}(x) = d\bar{A}(x)$ describes an inhomogeneous condensate of gauge fields. Then the left-hand side of Eq.(2.14) is of the form $g + \kappa(\bar{B} + \mathcal{F})$ where $\mathcal{F} = d\mathcal{A}$ with $\mathcal{A}(x) = \bar{A}(x) + A(x)$. It should be completely conceivable that it can be mapped to a noncommutative gauge theory of the gauge field $\mathcal{A}(x)$ in the constant \bar{B} -field background according to the Seiberg-Witten equivalence [10]. Let us denote the corresponding noncommutative gauge field as $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_a \equiv \hat{\bar{A}}_a + \hat{A}_a$. The only notable point is that the gauge field $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_a$ contains

an inhomogeneous background part \widehat{A}_a . This situation is, of course, analogous to an instanton (or soliton) background in gauge theory, as we remarked before.

So everything will go parallel with the constant case. We will consider a general situation in the context of the action (3.31) where background gauge fields are given by $\widehat{A}_\mu(z, y)$ as well as $\widehat{A}_b(z, y)$ which also depend on the commutative coordinates z^μ . Let us introduce the following covariant coordinates

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{X}^a(z, y) &= y^a + \theta^{ab}\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_b(z, y) = y^a + \theta^{ab}\widehat{A}_b(z, y) + \theta^{ab}\widehat{A}_b(z, y) \\ &\equiv Y^a(z, y) + \theta^{ab}\widehat{A}_b(z, y)\end{aligned}\quad (3.78)$$

where we identified the vacuum coordinates Y^a in (3.70) because we have to recover them after turning off the fluctuation \widehat{A}_a . Also introduce the covariant derivatives

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{D}_\mu(z, y) &= \partial_\mu - i\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_\mu(z, y) = \partial_\mu - i\widehat{A}_\mu(z, y) - i\widehat{A}_\mu(z, y) \\ &\equiv \widehat{\bar{D}}_\mu(z, y) - i\widehat{A}_\mu(z, y).\end{aligned}\quad (3.79)$$

Then the covariant derivatives in (3.27) can be defined in exactly the same way

$$\widehat{D}_A = \partial_A - i\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_A(z, y) = (\widehat{D}_\mu, -i\bar{B}_{ab}\widehat{X}^b)(z, y) \quad (3.80)$$

where $\partial_A = (\partial_\mu, -i\bar{B}_{ab}y^b)$. Now the noncommutative fields \widehat{D}_A in (3.80) can be mapped to vector fields using Eq.(3.33).

Because the results in Section 3.2 can be applied to arbitrary noncommutative gauge fields in a constant B -field, the same formulae can be applied to the present case with the understanding that the vector fields V_A in (3.33) refer to total gauge fields including the inhomogeneous background. This means that the vector fields $V_A = \lambda E_A \in \Gamma(TM)$ reduce to $\bar{V}_A = \bar{\lambda}\bar{E}_A$ after turning off the fluctuations where \bar{V}_A is determined by the background $(\partial_\mu - i\widehat{A}_\mu(z, y), -i\bar{B}_{ab}Y^b(z, y))$ and $\bar{\lambda}$ satisfies the relation

$$\bar{\lambda}^2 = \nu(\bar{V}_1, \dots, \bar{V}_D). \quad (3.81)$$

Therefore the D -dimensional metric is precisely given by (3.39) with $\mathbf{A}^a = \mathcal{A}_\mu^a dz^\mu$ and the metric for the background is given by

$$\begin{aligned}ds^2 &= \eta_{AB}\bar{E}^A \otimes \bar{E}^B \\ &= \bar{\lambda}^2 \eta_{AB}\bar{V}^A \otimes \bar{V}^B = \bar{\lambda}^2 \eta_{AB}\bar{V}_M^A \bar{V}_N^B dX^M \otimes dX^N.\end{aligned}\quad (3.82)$$

Here we have implicitly assumed that the background \bar{V}_A satisfies (3.50) and (3.51). In four dimensions, for instance, we know that the metric (3.82) describes Ricci-flat four manifolds if \bar{V}_A satisfies the self-duality equation (2.66).

Now let us look at the picture of the right-hand side of Eq.(2.14). After applying the Darboux transform (2.7) only for the symplectic structure (3.77) and leaving the fluctuations intact, the right-hand side becomes of the form $G_{ab}(y) + \kappa(\bar{B}_{ab} + \mathfrak{F}_{ab}(y))$ where

$$\mathfrak{F}_{ab}(y) = \frac{\partial x^\alpha}{\partial y^a} \frac{\partial x^\beta}{\partial y^b} F_{\alpha\beta}(x) \equiv \partial_a \mathfrak{A}_b(y) - \partial_b \mathfrak{A}_a(y) \quad (3.83)$$

and the metric $G_{ab}(y)$ is given by (2.11). Note that in this picture the gauge fields $\mathfrak{A}_a(y)$ are regarded as fluctuations propagating in the background $G_{ab}(y)$ and \bar{B}_{ab} . Therefore it would be reasonable to interpret the right-hand side of Eq.(2.14) as a noncommutative gauge theory of the gauge field $\mathfrak{A}_a(y)$ defined by the canonical noncommutative space (1.17) but in a curved space described by the metric $G_{ab}(y)$.

Although the formulation of noncommutative field theory in a generic curved spacetime is still a challenging problem, there is no hard obstacle to formulate emergent gravity if one confines to the commutative limit. Because the inhomogeneous condensate of gauge fields in the vacuum (3.77) now appears as an explicit background metric, the metric (3.39) in this picture will be replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= h_{AB} E^A \otimes E^B \\ &= \Lambda^2 h_{AB} V^A \otimes V^B = \Lambda^2 h_{AB} V_M^A V_N^B dX^M \otimes dX^N \end{aligned} \quad (3.84)$$

where h_{AB} is the metric in the space spanned by noncoordinate bases $V_A = \Lambda E_A$ [65]. Because the metric (3.84) has the Riemannian volume form $\nu_g = \sqrt{-h} E^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge E^D$ instead of (3.42), the volume form $\nu = \Lambda^{(2-D)} \nu_g$ in (3.40) will be given by

$$\nu = \sqrt{-h} \Lambda^2 V^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge V^D. \quad (3.85)$$

So the function Λ in Eq.(3.84) will be determined by the condition

$$\sqrt{-h} \Lambda^2 = \nu(V_1, \cdots, V_D). \quad (3.86)$$

Because the anholonomic basis V^A in (3.84) will become flat when fluctuations are turned off, i.e., $\mathfrak{F}_{ab} = 0$, the background metric in this picture is simply given by

$$ds^2 = \bar{\Lambda}^2 h_{MN} dX^M \otimes dX^N \quad (3.87)$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}^2 = 1/\sqrt{-h}$.

As usual, the torsion free condition (2.80) for the metric (3.84) will be imposed to get the relation (2.81) where $\omega_{ABC} = h_{BD} \omega_A^D{}_C$ and $f_{ABC} = h_{CD} f_{AB}^D{}_C$ where the indices A, B, \cdots are raised and lowered using the metric h_{AB} . Because h_{AB} is not a flat metric, $\omega_A^B{}_C$ in (2.78) or (2.79) will actually be the Levi-Civita connection in noncoordinate bases rather than a spin connection, but we will keep the notation for convenience. And the condition that the metric (3.84) is covariantly constant, i.e., $\nabla_C (h_{AB} E^A \otimes E^B) = 0$, leads to the relation [65]

$$\omega_{ABC} = \frac{1}{2} (E_A h_{BC} - E_B h_{CA} + E_C h_{AB}) + \frac{1}{2} (f_{ABC} - f_{BCA} + f_{CAB}). \quad (3.88)$$

The curvature tensors have exactly the same form as (2.83). All the calculation in Section 2.3 can be repeated in the same way even for this case although the details will be much more complicated and have not been performed so far.

By comparing the two metrics, (3.82) and (3.87), we finally get the following relations [5]

$$h_{MN} = \eta_{AB} \bar{V}_M^A \bar{V}_N^B, \quad \bar{\Lambda}^2 = \bar{\lambda}^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}}, \quad (3.89)$$

which is, of course, consistent with our earlier observation.

One may wonder whether the emergent gravity for symplectic structures can smoothly taken over to the case where only a Poisson structure is available. It was shown in [38] that emergent gravity can nicely be generalized to a Poisson manifold (M, π) . A Poisson manifold M is a differentiable manifold M equipped with a bivector field (not necessarily nondegenerate) $\pi = \pi^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \wedge \partial_\nu \in \Lambda^2 TM$ which defines an \mathbf{R} -bilinear antisymmetric operation $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\pi : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ by

$$(f, g) \mapsto \{f, g\}_\pi = \langle \pi, df \otimes dg \rangle = \pi^{\mu\nu}(x) \partial_\mu f(x) \partial_\nu g(x) \quad (3.90)$$

such that the bracket, called the Poisson bracket, satisfies

$$1) \text{ Leibniz rule : } \{f, gh\}_\pi = g\{f, h\}_\pi + \{f, g\}_\pi h, \quad (3.91)$$

$$2) \text{ Jacobi identity : } \{f, \{g, h\}_\pi\}_\pi + \{g, \{h, f\}_\pi\}_\pi + \{h, \{f, g\}_\pi\}_\pi = 0, \quad (3.92)$$

$\forall f, g, h \in C^\infty(M)$. Poisson manifolds appear as a natural generalization of symplectic manifolds where the Poisson structure reduces to a symplectic structure if π is nongenerate [6].

One can show that the Jacobi identity (3.92) for the bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\pi$ is equivalent to the condition that the Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket [66] for the Poisson tensor π vanishes, i.e.,

$$[\pi, \pi]_{SN} \equiv \left(\pi^{\lambda\mu} \frac{\partial \pi^{\nu\rho}}{\partial x^\lambda} + \pi^{\lambda\nu} \frac{\partial \pi^{\rho\mu}}{\partial x^\lambda} + \pi^{\lambda\rho} \frac{\partial \pi^{\mu\nu}}{\partial x^\lambda} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\rho} = 0. \quad (3.93)$$

Like the Darboux theorem in symplectic manifolds, the Poisson geometry also enjoys a similar property known as the splitting theorem proved by A. Weinstein [67]. The splitting theorem states that a d -dimensional Poisson manifold is locally equivalent to the product of \mathbf{R}^{2n} equipped with the canonical symplectic structure with \mathbf{R}^{d-2n} equipped with a Poisson structure of rank zero at the origin. That is, the Poisson manifold (M, π) is locally isomorphic (in a neighborhood of $x \in M$) to the direct product $S \times N$ of a symplectic manifold $(S, \sum_{i=1}^n dq^i \wedge dp_i)$ with a Poisson manifold $(N_x, \{\cdot, \cdot\}_N)$ whose Poisson tensor vanishes at x .

A well-known example of Poisson manifold is four-sphere where no symplectic structure is available. If M is a compact symplectic manifold, the second de Rham cohomology group $H^2(M)$ is nontrivial and so the only n -sphere that admits a symplectic form is the 2-sphere. For example, let $\mathbf{S}^4 = \{(u, v, t) \in \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{R} : |u|^2 + |v|^2 = t(2 - t)\}$. Then the bivector field $\pi = uv \partial_u \wedge \partial_v - uv^* \partial_u \wedge \partial_{v^*} - u^* v \partial_{u^*} \wedge \partial_v + u^* v^* \partial_{u^*} \wedge \partial_{v^*}$ is a Poisson tensor, that is, $[\pi, \pi]_{SN} = 0$, and

$\pi \wedge \pi = 4|u|^2|v|^2\partial_u \wedge \partial_v \wedge \partial_{u^*} \wedge \partial_{v^*}$. Therefore the Poisson tensor π vanishes on a subspace of either $u = 0$ or $v = 0$ and the Poisson structure becomes degenerate there. In this case, we have to rely on a Poisson structure rather than a symplectic structure to formulate emergent gravity [38].

The Poisson tensor π of a Poisson manifold M induces a bundle map $\pi^\sharp : T^*M \rightarrow TM$ by

$$A \mapsto \pi^\sharp(A) = \pi^{\mu\nu}(x)A_\mu(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \quad (3.94)$$

for $A = A_\mu(x)dx^\mu \in T_x^*M$, which is called the anchor map of π [66]. See also Section 6. The rank of the Poisson structure at a point $x \in M$ is defined as the rank of the anchor map at this point. If the rank equals the dimension of the manifold at each point, the Poisson structure reduces to a symplectic structure which is also called nondegenerate. The nondegenerate Poisson structure uniquely determines the symplectic structure defined by a 2-form $\omega = \frac{1}{2}\omega_{\mu\nu}(x)dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu = \pi^{-1}$ and the condition (3.93) is equivalent to the statement that the 2-form ω is closed, $d\omega = 0$. In this case the anchor map $\pi^\sharp : T^*M \rightarrow TM$ is a bundle isomorphism as we discussed in Section 1.

To define a Hamiltonian vector field $\pi^\sharp(df)$ of a smooth function $f \in C^\infty(M)$, what one really needs is a Poisson structure which reduces to a symplectic structure for the nondegenerate case. A Hamiltonian vector field $X_f = -\pi^\sharp(df)$ for a smooth function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ is defined by the anchor map (3.94) as follows

$$X_f(g) = -\langle \pi, df \otimes dg \rangle = \{g, f\}_\pi = \pi^{\mu\nu}(x)\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^\nu}\frac{\partial g}{\partial x^\mu}. \quad (3.95)$$

Given a smooth Poisson manifold (M, π) , the map $f \mapsto X_f = -\pi^\sharp(df)$ is a homomorphism [66] from the Lie algebra $C^\infty(M)$ of smooth functions under the Poisson bracket to the Lie algebra of smooth vector fields under the Lie bracket. In other words, the Lie algebra homomorphism (1.10) is still true even for any Poisson manifold.

As we just noticed, it is enough to have a Poisson structure to achieve the map $C^\infty(M) \rightarrow \Gamma(TM) : f \mapsto X_f = -\pi^\sharp(df)$ such as (1.9). As we discussed earlier, any Poisson manifold can be quantized via deformation quantization [12]:

$$\{x^\mu, x^\nu\}_\pi = \pi^{\mu\nu}(x) \rightarrow [\hat{x}^\mu, \hat{x}^\nu]_{\hat{\pi}} = i\kappa \hat{\pi}^{\mu\nu}(\hat{x}) \quad (3.96)$$

where we introduced a deformation parameter κ of $(\text{length})^2$ and $\hat{\pi}^{ab}(\hat{x}) \in \mathcal{A}_\pi$ are so assumed to be dimensionless operators. Therefore, the anchor map (3.95) can be lifted to a noncommutative manifold as in (3.14):

$$\hat{V}_a[\hat{f}](x) \equiv -i[\hat{D}_a(x), \hat{f}(x)]_{\hat{\pi}} \quad (3.97)$$

for any noncommutative field $\hat{D}_a(x) \in \mathcal{A}_\pi$ (dropping the hat in the coordinates $\hat{x}^\mu \in \mathcal{A}_\pi$ for simple notation). Then everything will go exactly parallel with the symplectic case if we define emergent quantum gravity from a gauge theory defined on the noncommutative space (3.96) with the generalized vector fields in (3.97). It was studied in [38] how a fuzzy Poisson manifold can be derived from a mass deformed matrix model, from which the picture of emergent gravity was checked.

4 Emergent Matters

We have stressed that quantum gravity should be background independent where any kind of spacetime structure is not assumed. It is only required to postulate morphisms between objects. An underlying theory, for example, only has matrices (as objects) which are subject to some algebraic relations such as the Jacobi identity and the equations of motion (as morphisms). But we can derive a spacetime geometry from these algebraic relations between objects by mapping the matrix algebra to a Poisson or noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ and then to a derivation algebra $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A}_\theta)$ of \mathcal{A}_θ . We observed that such an operator algebra, e.g., \star -algebra can be defined by noncommutative gauge fields and a smooth geometry emerges from them at a macroscopic world. Depending on the choice of an algebraic relation, we get a different geometry. In this scheme, the geometry is a derived concept defined by the algebra [11]. In a deep noncommutative space, a smooth geometry is doomed, instead an algebra between objects becomes more fundamental. Ergo, the motto of emergent gravity is that an algebra defines a geometry. One has to specify an underlying algebra to talk about a corresponding geometry.

As a recitation, the emergence of gravity necessarily requires the emergence of spacetime itself. If spacetime is emergent, then all fields supported on this spacetime must be emergent too. Somehow, matter fields and other non-Abelian gauge fields for weak and strong forces must be emergent together with spacetime. How is it possible ? How to define matter fields describing quarks and leptons in the context of emergent geometry ?

We may start with a naive reasoning. First note that translations in noncommutative directions are an inner automorphism of the noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ generated by the coordinates in (1.17),

$$e^{-ik^a B_{ab} y^b} \star \hat{f}(y) \star e^{ik^a B_{ab} y^b} = \hat{f}(y + k) \quad (4.1)$$

for any $\hat{f}(y) \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$. The inner automorphism (4.1) is nontrivial only in the case of a noncommutative algebra [7], that is, commutative algebras do not possess any inner automorphism. So every “points” in noncommutative space are indistinguishable, i.e., unitarily equivalent while every points in commutative space are distinguishable, i.e., unitarily inequivalent. As a result, one loses the meaning of “point” in noncommutative space. Hence the concept of “particle” becomes ambiguous too. So first we may address the question before matter fields: What is a particle in noncommutative spacetime ?

When a space becomes noncommutative, there is a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} associated with the space such as (1.18) and so a point or a particle may be replaced by a state in \mathcal{H} . Then the most natural concept of a particle in noncommutative space may be a localized state in \mathcal{H} . But, because the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is a complex vector space as usual, such a localized state will tend to be dissipative due to a linear superposition between nearby states. Therefore, the most natural and pertinent concept of a particle in noncommutative space may be a *stable localized state* in \mathcal{H} . This means [5] that a particle may be realized as a topological object in the noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ .

As illustrated by quantum mechanics, noncommutative algebras admit a much greater variety of algebraic and topological structures, compared to commutative ones. Likewise, when spacetime at fundamental level is replaced by a noncommutative algebra, algebraic and topological structures in

the noncommutative spacetime actually become extremely rich and coherent [11], which would, we guess, be responsible for emergent properties, e.g., diffeomorphisms, gauge symmetries and matter fields.

This line of thought is our naive reasoning about how to realize a particle or matter field in non-commutative spacetime. We think this idea would direct to a reasonable track but an involved math often blocks up the road with homology, cohomology, homotopy, module, category, K-theory, etc. Thereby we will try to get more insights from physics.

4.1 Feynman's view on electrodynamics

In a very charming paper [42], Dyson explains the Feynman's view about the electrodynamics of a charged particle. Feynman starts with an assumption that a particle exists with position x^i and velocity \dot{x}_i satisfying commutation relations

$$[x^i, x^k] = 0, \quad m[x^i, \dot{x}_k] = i\hbar\delta_k^i. \quad (4.2)$$

Then he asks a question: What is the most general form of forces appearing in the Newton's equation $m\ddot{x}_i = F_i(x, \dot{x}, t)$ consistent with the commutation relation (4.2) ? Remarkably he ends up with the electromagnetic force

$$m\frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = e(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}). \quad (4.3)$$

In a sense, the Feynman's result is a no-go theorem for the consistent interaction of particles in quantum mechanics. It turns out that the conditions (4.2) are restrictive enough such that only the electromagnetic force (4.3) is compatible with them.

We here reproduce his argument with a puny refinement. We will start with the Feynman's assumption together with the Hamilton's equation

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[H, f] + \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $f = f(x, p, t)$, $H = H(x, p, t) \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar$ and $\dot{x}_i \equiv \dot{x}_i(x, p)$. But we will not assume the Newton's equation $m\ddot{x}_i = F_i(x, \dot{x}, t)$. To be precise, we replaced the Newton's equation by (4.4), i.e.,

$$m\frac{d\dot{x}_i}{dt} = \frac{im}{\hbar}[H, \dot{x}_i] \equiv F_i(x, p, t). \quad (4.5)$$

First consider the following commutator

$$\begin{aligned} [H, [x^i, \dot{x}_k]] &= [x^i, [H, \dot{x}_k]] - [\dot{x}_k, [H, x^i]] \\ &= -i\hbar\left(\frac{1}{m}[x^i, F_k] + [\dot{x}_i, \dot{x}_k]\right) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

The Jacobi identity $[x^l, [\dot{x}_i, \dot{x}_k]] + [\dot{x}_i, [\dot{x}_k, x^l]] + [\dot{x}_k, [x^l, \dot{x}_i]] = [x^l, [\dot{x}_i, \dot{x}_k]] = 0$ with (4.6) implies

$$[x^l, [x^i, F_k]] = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Equation (4.6) also implies $[x^i, F_k] + [x^k, F_i] = 0$ and so we may write

$$[x^i, F_k] = -\frac{i\hbar}{m}\varepsilon^{ikl}B_l. \quad (4.8)$$

Equation (4.8) is the definition of the field $B_l = B_l(x, p, t) \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar$. But Eq.(4.7) says

$$[x^l, B_m] = 0, \quad (4.9)$$

which means that B_m is a function of x and t only, i.e., $B_m = B_m(x, t)$. Then we can solve Eq.(4.8) with

$$F_i(x, p, t) = E_i(x, t) + \varepsilon^{ikl}\langle \dot{x}_k B_l(x, t) \rangle, \quad (4.10)$$

where $E_i(x, t) \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar$ is an arbitrary function which also depends x and t only and the symbol $\langle \cdots \rangle$ denotes the Weyl-ordering, i.e., the complete symmetrization of operator products.

Combining (4.6) and (4.8) leads to

$$B_l = -\frac{im^2}{2\hbar}\varepsilon^{lik}[\dot{x}_i, \dot{x}_k]. \quad (4.11)$$

Another Jacobi identity $\varepsilon^{ijk}[\dot{x}_i, [\dot{x}_j, \dot{x}_k]] = 0$ then implies

$$[\dot{x}_i, B_i] = -\frac{i\hbar}{m}\left\langle \frac{\partial B_i}{\partial x^i} \right\rangle = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

Take the total derivative of Eq.(4.11) with respect to time. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \dot{x}_i \frac{\partial B_l}{\partial x^i} \right\rangle + \frac{\partial B_l}{\partial t} &= \frac{m^2}{2\hbar^2}\varepsilon^{lik}[H, [\dot{x}_i, \dot{x}_k]] \\ &= \frac{im}{\hbar}\varepsilon^{lik}[\dot{x}_k, F_i] \\ &= \frac{im}{\hbar}\left(-\varepsilon^{lik}[\dot{x}_i, E_k] - [\dot{x}_i, \dot{x}_l]B_i - \dot{x}_l[\dot{x}_i, B_i] + \langle \dot{x}_i[\dot{x}_i, B_l] \rangle\right) \\ &= -\varepsilon^{lik}\left\langle \frac{\partial E_k}{\partial x^i} \right\rangle + \frac{1}{m}\varepsilon^{lik}B_iB_k + \left\langle \dot{x}_i \frac{\partial B_l}{\partial x^i} \right\rangle \\ &= -\varepsilon^{lik}\left\langle \frac{\partial E_k}{\partial x^i} \right\rangle + \left\langle \dot{x}_i \frac{\partial B_l}{\partial x^i} \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

From Eq.(4.13), we finally get

$$\frac{\partial B_l}{\partial t} + \varepsilon^{lik}\left\langle \frac{\partial E_k}{\partial x^i} \right\rangle = 0. \quad (4.14)$$

We arrived at the force (4.10) (by the definition (4.5)) where the fields $E_i(x, t)$ and $B_i(x, t)$ should satisfy (4.12) and (4.14). We immediately recognize that they are electromagnetic fields. Therefore we get a remarkable result [42] that the Lorentz force (4.3) is only a consistent interaction with a quantum particle satisfying the commutation relations (4.2). Remember that we have only assumed the commutation relation (4.2) and only used the Hamilton's equation (4.4) and the Jacobi identity to

find a consistent interaction of quantum particles. But we could get the electromagnetic force (4.3) only. What a so surprising (at least to us) !

But the Feynman's observation raises a curious question. We know that, beside the electromagnetic force, there exist other interactions, weak and strong forces, in Nature. Thus the question is how to incorporate the weak and strong forces together into the Feynman's scheme. Because he started only with very natural axioms, there seems to be no room to relax his postulates to include the weak and strong forces except introducing extra dimensions. Surprisingly it works with extra dimensions !

Consider a particle motion defined on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times F$ with an internal space F whose coordinates are $\{x^i : i = 1, 2, 3\} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\{Q^I : I = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1\} \in F$. The dynamics of the particle carrying an internal charge in F [43, 44] is defined by a symplectic structure on $T^*\mathbb{R}^3 \times F$ whose commutative relations are given by

$$[x^i, x^k] = 0, \quad m[x^i, \dot{x}_k] = i\hbar\delta_k^i, \quad (4.15)$$

$$[Q^I, Q^J] = i\hbar f^{IJ}{}_K Q^K, \quad (4.16)$$

$$[x^i, Q^I] = 0. \quad (4.17)$$

Note that the internal space F is a Poisson manifold (F, π) whose Poisson structure is given by $\pi = \frac{1}{2}\pi^{IJ}\partial_I \wedge \partial_J = \frac{1}{2}f^{IJ}{}_K Q^K \partial_I \wedge \partial_J$ and defines the $SU(n)$ Lie algebra (4.16). That is, by (3.93),

$$[\pi, \pi]_{SN} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f^{JK}{}_L f^{LI}{}_M + f^{KI}{}_L f^{LJ}{}_M + f^{IJ}{}_L f^{LK}{}_M = 0. \quad (4.18)$$

And the internal coordinates Q^I are assumed to obey the Wong's equation [68]

$$\dot{Q}^I + f^I{}_{JK} A_i^J(x, t) Q^K \dot{x}_i = 0. \quad (4.19)$$

The Wong's equation just says that the internal charge Q^I is parallel-transported along the trajectory of a particle under the influence of the non-Abelian gauge field A_i^I .

The geometrical meaning of the Wong's equation (4.19) can be seen as follows. Taking the total derivative of (4.17) with respect to time gives

$$[\dot{x}_i, Q^I] = -[x^i, \dot{Q}^I] = \frac{i\hbar}{m} f^I{}_{JK} A_i^J(x, t) Q^K. \quad (4.20)$$

This property can be used to show the formula for any field $\phi(x, t) = \phi^I(x, t) Q^I \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar \times \mathcal{G}$:

$$\begin{aligned} [\dot{x}_i, \phi^I(x, t) Q^I] &= [\dot{x}_i, \phi^I(x, t)] Q^I + \phi^I(x, t) [\dot{x}_i, Q^I] \\ &= -\frac{i\hbar}{m} (\partial_i \phi^I + f^I{}_{JK} A_i^J \phi^K) Q^I \\ &= -\frac{i\hbar}{m} (\partial_i \phi - \frac{i}{\hbar} [A_i, \phi]) \equiv -\frac{i\hbar}{m} D_i \phi. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Recalling that $p_i = m\dot{x}_i + A_i(x, t)$ are translation generators along \mathbb{R}^3 , we see the geometrical meaning of the Wong's equation (4.19) stated above.

Now repeat the Feynman's question: What is the most general interaction of a quantum particle carrying an internal charge satisfying (4.19) and the commutation relations (4.15)-(4.17) ? The calculation follows almost the same line [43] as the electromagnetic force except that the fields $E_i(x, t) = E_i^I(x, t)Q^I \in \mathcal{A}_h \times \mathcal{G}$ and $B_i(x, t) = B_i^I(x, t)Q^I \in \mathcal{A}_h \times \mathcal{G}$ now carry internal charges in the Lie algebra \mathcal{G} and so the Wong's equation (4.19) has to be taken into account. We will not echo the derivation because it is almost straightforward with a careful Weyl-ordering. It may be a good exercise for graduate students.

The resulting force exerted on a quantum particle moving in $\mathbf{R}^3 \times F$ is the generalized non-Abelian Lorentz force [43]

$$F_i = E_i + \varepsilon^{ikl} \dot{x}_k B_l \quad (4.22)$$

where the fields $E_i(x, t) = E_i^I(x, t)Q^I$ and $B_i(x, t) = B_i^I(x, t)Q^I$ satisfy

$$\partial_i B_i - \frac{i}{\hbar} [A_i, B_i] = 0, \quad \frac{\partial B_i}{\partial t} + \varepsilon^{ikl} \left(\partial_k E_l - \frac{i}{\hbar} [A_k, E_l] \right) = 0. \quad (4.23)$$

The equations (4.23), of course, can be summarized with the Lorentz covariant form (in the temporal gauge, $A_0 = 0$)

$$\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} D_\nu F_{\rho\sigma} = 0 \quad (4.24)$$

and the Bianchi identity (4.24) can be solved by introducing non-Abelian gauge fields A_μ such that

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu - \frac{i}{\hbar} [A_\mu, A_\nu]. \quad (4.25)$$

One can check the expression (4.25) using the Jacobi identity

$$[Q^I, [\dot{x}_i, \dot{x}_k]] + [\dot{x}_i, [\dot{x}_k, Q^I]] + [\dot{x}_k, [Q^I, \dot{x}_i]] = 0 \quad (4.26)$$

together with (4.11) where $B_l = B_l^I Q^I$ and (4.20), i.e., one can get

$$\varepsilon^{ikl} B_l^I = \partial_i A_k^I - \partial_k A_i^I + f^I_{JK} A_i^J A_k^K. \quad (4.27)$$

4.2 Symplectic geometry again

The previous Feynman's argument clearly exposes us that the fundamental interactions such as electromagnetic, weak and strong forces can be understood as a symplectic or Poisson geometry of particle phase space. Feynman starts with a very natural assumption about the Poisson structure of a particle interacting with external forces. In the case of free particle, Eq.(4.1) is the well-know Heisenberg algebra; $[x^i, x^k] = 0$, $[x^i, p_k] = i\hbar\delta_k^i$. (Note that Feynman and Dyson intentionally use $m\dot{x}_i$ instead of p_i .) If some external fields are turned on, then the particle velocity $m\dot{x}_i$ is no longer equal to p_i but is shifted by $p_i - A_i$ where A_i are arbitrary external fields. And we easily see that, if the external fields A_i depend only on x and t , i.e., $A_i = A_i(x, t)$, and satisfy the Wong's equation (4.19) in non-Abelian cases (to preserve the localizability (4.17)), the commutation relations (4.1) remain intact. But it is

not the whole story. We have repeatedly used the Jacobi identity of the algebra \mathcal{A}_h or $\mathcal{A}_h \times \mathcal{G}$, which is originally coming from the Poisson algebra (1.4) of particle phase space P or $P \times F$. Recall that the Jacobi identity of Poisson bracket is not automatically guaranteed. The Schouten-Nijenhuis bracket for the Poisson tensor should vanish [66]. See Eq.(3.93). Therefore the external fields A_i cannot be completely arbitrary. They should not ruin the underlying Poisson structure. We know that, if the Poisson structure is nondegenerate, this condition is equivalent to the statement that the symplectic 2-form uniquely determined by the Poisson structure must be closed. See the paragraph in (3.94). This is precisely the condition for gauge fields Feynman found. In gauge theory we call it the Bianchi identity, e.g., $dF = 0$ or $DF = 0$, i.e., (4.12), (4.14) and (4.24).

There is another beautiful observation [45] (originally due to Jean-Marie Souriau) realizing the Feynman's idea. Let (P, ω) be a symplectic manifold. One can properly choose local canonical coordinates $y^a \equiv (x^1, p_1, \dots, x^n, p_n)$ in P such that the symplectic structure ω can be written in the form

$$\omega = \sum_{i=1}^n dx^i \wedge dp_i. \quad (4.28)$$

Then $\omega \in \bigwedge^2 T^*P$ can be thought as a bundle map $\omega : TP \rightarrow T^*P$. Because ω is nondegenerate at any point $y \in P$, we can invert this map to obtain the map $\eta \equiv \omega^{-1} : T^*P \rightarrow TP$. This cosymplectic structure $\eta = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \in \bigwedge^2 TP$ is called the Poisson structure of P which defines a Poisson bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_h$. See Section 3.4. In a local chart with coordinates y^a , we have

$$\{f, g\}_h = \sum_{a,b=1}^{2n} \eta^{ab} \frac{\partial f}{\partial y^a} \frac{\partial g}{\partial y^b}. \quad (4.29)$$

Let $H : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function on a Poisson manifold (P, η) . The vector field X_H defined by $\iota_{X_H} \omega = dH$ is called the Hamiltonian vector field with the energy function H . We define a dynamical flow by the differential equation [6]

$$\frac{df}{dt} = X_H(f) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \{f, H\}_h + \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}. \quad (4.30)$$

A solution of the above equation is a function f such that for any path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ we have

$$\frac{df(\gamma(t))}{dt} = \{f, H\}_h(\gamma(t)) + \frac{\partial f(\gamma(t))}{\partial t}. \quad (4.31)$$

The dynamics of a charged particle in an external static magnetic field is described by the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} (\mathbf{p} - e\mathbf{A})^2 \quad (4.32)$$

which is obtained by the free Hamiltonian $H_0 = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m}$ with the replacement

$$\mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{p} - e\mathbf{A}. \quad (4.33)$$

Here the electric charge of an electron is $q_e = -e$ and e is a coupling constant identified with g_{YM} . The symplectic structure (4.28) leads to the Hamiltonian vector field X_H given by

$$X_H = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\partial H}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}. \quad (4.34)$$

Then the Hamilton's equation (4.30) reduces to the well-known Lorentz force law

$$m \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = e\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}. \quad (4.35)$$

An interesting observation [45] (originally due to Jean-Marie Souriau) is that the Lorentz force law (4.35) can be derived by keeping the Hamiltonian $H = H_0$ but instead shifting the symplectic structure

$$\omega \rightarrow \omega' = \omega - eB \quad (4.36)$$

where $B = \frac{1}{2}B_{ik}(x)dx^i \wedge dx^k$. In this case the Hamiltonian vector field X_H defined by $\iota_{X_H}\omega' = dH_0$ is given by

$$X_H = \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} - \left(\frac{\partial H_0}{\partial x^i} - eB_{ik} \frac{\partial H_0}{\partial p_k} \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}. \quad (4.37)$$

Then one can easily check that the Hamilton's equation (4.30) with the vector field (4.37) reproduces the Lorentz force law (4.35). Actually one can show that the symplectic structure ω' in Eq.(4.36) introduces a noncommutative phase space [7] such that the momentum space becomes noncommutative, i.e., $[p'_i, p'_j] = -i\hbar e B_{ij}$.

If a particle is interacting with electromagnetic fields, the influence of the magnetic field $B = dA$ is described by the 'minimal coupling' (4.33) and the new momenta $\mathbf{p}' = -i\hbar(\nabla - i\frac{e}{\hbar}\mathbf{A})$ are covariant under $U(1)$ gauge transformations. Let us point out that the minimal coupling (4.33) can be understood as the Darboux transformation (2.7) between ω and ω' . Consider the coordinate transformation $y^a \mapsto x^a(y) = (X^1, P_1, \dots, X^n, P_n)(x, p)$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n dx^i \wedge dp_i = \sum_{i=1}^n dX^i \wedge dP_i - \frac{e}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n B_{ij}(X) dX^i \wedge dX^j \quad (4.38)$$

but the Hamiltonian is unchanged, i.e., $H_0 = \frac{\mathbf{P}^2}{2m}$. The condition (4.38) is equivalent to the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial X^j} \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial X^k} - \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial X^k} \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial X^j} &= -eB_{jk}, \\ \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial X^j} \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial P_k} - \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial P_j} \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial X^k} &= \delta_j^k, \\ \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial P_j} \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial P_k} - \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial P_k} \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial P_j} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

The above equations are solved by

$$x^i = X^i, \quad p_i = P_i + eA_i(X). \quad (4.40)$$

In summary the dynamics of a charged particle in an electromagnetic field has two equivalent descriptions [5]:

$$\left(H = \frac{(\mathbf{p} - e\mathbf{A})^2}{2m}, \omega\right)(x, p) \cong \left(H_0 = \frac{\mathbf{P}^2}{2m}, \omega' = \omega - eB\right)(X, P). \quad (4.41)$$

The equivalence (4.41) can easily be generalized to a time-dependent background $A^\mu = (A^0, \mathbf{A})(x, t)$ with the Hamiltonian $H = \frac{1}{2m}(\mathbf{p} - e\mathbf{A})^2 + eA^0$. The Hamilton's equation (4.30) in this case is given by (4.3). The equivalence (4.41) now means that the Lorentz force law (4.3) can be obtained by the Hamiltonian vector field (4.37) with the Hamiltonian $H_0 = \frac{\mathbf{P}^2}{2m} + eA^0$ by noticing that the time dependence of the external fields now appears as the explicit t -dependence of momenta $p_i = p_i(t)$. Indeed the electric field \mathbf{E} appears as the combination $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla A^0 + \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{A}}{\partial t}$. But note that the coordinates (x^i, p_i) in Eq.(4.37) correspond to (X^i, P_i) in the notation (4.38) and so $\frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial t} = -e\frac{\partial \mathbf{A}}{\partial t}$ by Eq.(4.40).

The Feynman's approach transparently showed that the electromagnetism is an inevitable structure in quantum particle dynamics and we need an internal space (extra dimensions) to introduce non-Abelian forces. Furthermore, as emphasized by Dyson [42], the Feynman's formulation also shows that nonrelativistic Newtonian mechanics and relativistic Maxwell's equations are coexisting peacefully. This is due to the underlying symplectic geometry as Souriau and Sternberg [45] show. We know that the Lorentz force (4.3) is generated by the minimal coupling $p_\mu \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}_\mu \equiv p_\mu - eA_\mu$ and the minimal coupling can be encoded into the deformation of symplectic structure, which can be summarized as the relativistic form [69]: $\omega = -d\xi \rightarrow \omega' = \omega - eF = -d(\xi + eA)$ where $\xi = \mathfrak{P}_\mu dx^\mu$ and $A = A_\mu(x)dx^\mu$. Therefore the Maxwell equation $dF = 0$ is simply interpreted as the closedness of the symplectic structure and the minimal coupling is the Darboux transformation (2.7) for the deformed symplectic structure $\omega' = \omega - eF$, as was shown in (4.38). In this symplectic formulation of particle dynamics, the gauge symmetry defined by $A \rightarrow A + d\lambda$ is actually symplectomorphisms, i.e., diffeomorphisms generated by Hamiltonian vector fields X_λ satisfying $\mathcal{L}_{X_\lambda}\omega = 0$. In this sense, the gauge symmetry is derived from the symplectic or Poisson geometry and so one may regard the underlying symplectic or Poisson structure as a more fundamental structure of particle dynamics. Also one may notice a great similarity between the symplectic geometries of particles and spacetime geometry (gravity).

A symplectic formulation of the equations of motion of a particle was generalized to a Yang-Mills field by Sternberg in [45] and Weinstein in [70]. Let $\pi : P \rightarrow M$ be a principal G -bundle. And let F be a Hamiltonian G -space, this means that F is a symplectic manifold with symplectic form Ω that G acts on F as a group of symplectic diffeomorphisms, so that there is a homomorphism of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G into the algebra of Hamiltonian vector fields, and that we are given a lifting of this homomorphism to a homomorphism of \mathfrak{g} into the Lie algebra of functions on F where the Lie algebra structure is given by Poisson bracket. Thus, to each $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ we get a function f_ξ on F and a Hamiltonian vector field ξ_F on F so that $\iota_{\xi_F}\Omega = -df_\xi$.

Let $E \subset T^*M \times P$ be the pull-back of P by the canonical projection $\tilde{\pi} : T^*M \rightarrow M$, i.e. the

following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 E & \xrightarrow{Pr_2} & P \\
 Pr_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\
 T^*M & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}} & M
 \end{array}$$

Sternberg shows [45] how a connection on P can be used to put a symplectic structure on the associated bundle $E \times_G F \rightarrow T^*M$ with fibre F . Given a Hamiltonian function $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, one may pull it back to $E \times_G F$ and thereby obtain a Hamiltonian flow which represents the motion of a classical particle under the influence of the field for which the given connection is a Yang-Mills field. That is, every connection on a principal bundle P induces a Poisson structure on the associated bundle $E \times_G F$. The resulting symplectic mechanics of a particle in a Yang-Mills field is actually equivalent to the Feynman's approach in Section 4.1. More details in terms of local formula will be discussed elsewhere.

4.3 Emergent matters from stable geometries

Now let us pose our original problem about what matter is in emergent geometry. We speculated that particles or matter fields may be realized as a topological object in a noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ and thus a stable localized state in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , e.g., the Fock space (1.18). If so, we may assign the concept of positions and velocities (as collective variables) to these localized states such that they satisfy some well-defined (quantum) Poisson algebra, e.g., (4.15)-(4.17), which are inherited from the original noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ . Here we will suggest a plausible picture based on the Fermi-surface scenario in [71, 72]. But we will not insist on our proposal.

Particles are by definition characterized by their positions and momenta besides their intrinsic charges, e.g., spin, isospin and an electric charge. They should be replaced by a matter field in relativistic quantum theory in order to incorporate pair creations and pair annihilations. Moreover, in a noncommutative space such as (1.17), the very notion of a point is replaced by a state in the Hilbert space (1.18) and thus the concept of particles (and matter fields too) becomes ambiguous. So the following question should be meaningful and addressed: What is the most natural notion of a particle or a corresponding matter field in the noncommutative \star -algebra (1.19) ? We suggested in [5] it should be a K-theory object in the sense of [71].

We will consider the $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theory described by the action (3.21) defined on a d -dimensional Minkowski spacetime \mathbb{R}_C^d . As we explained in Section 3.3, the theory (3.21) can be related to both $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theories and noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theories in various dimensions and different B -field backgrounds by applying the matrix T-duality (3.58) and the correspondence (1.22). Thereby we will assume that the $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theory (3.21) has been obtained from the BFSS matrix model (3.60) by the $(d - 1)$ -fold matrix T-duality (3.58). In particular, it will

be important to remember that the $U(N \rightarrow \infty)$ gauge theory (3.21) in the Moyal background (3.22) can be mapped to the $D = d + 2n$ -dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory (3.31).

Motivated by this fact, we will specify our problem as follows. We want to classify a stable class of “time-independent solutions” in the action (3.31) satisfying the asymptotic boundary condition (3.22). For such kind of solutions, we may simply forget about time and work in the temporal gauge, $A_0 = 0$. Therefore we will consider the $U(N)$ gauge-Higgs system $(\mathbf{A}, \Phi^a)(\mathbf{x})$ as the map from \mathbf{R}_C^p to $GL(N, \mathbb{C})$ where $p \equiv d - 1$ and $z^\mu = (t, \mathbf{x})$. As long as we require the fields in the theory to approach the common limit (3.22) (which does not depend on \mathbf{x}) as $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \infty$ in any direction, we can think of \mathbf{R}^p as having the topology of a sphere $\mathbf{S}^p = \mathbf{R}^p \cup \{\infty\}$, with the point at infinity included as an ordinary point.

Note that the matrices $\Phi^a(\mathbf{x})$ ($a = 1, \dots, 2n$) are nondegenerate along \mathbf{S}^p because we have assumed (3.22). Therefore Φ^a defines a well-defined map [71]

$$\Phi^a : \mathbf{S}^p \rightarrow GL(N, \mathbb{C}) \quad (4.42)$$

from \mathbf{S}^p to the group of nondegenerate complex $N \times N$ matrices. If this map represents a nontrivial class in the p th homotopy group $\pi_p(GL(N, \mathbb{C}))$, the solution (4.42) will be stable under small perturbations, and the corresponding nontrivial element of $\pi_p(GL(N, \mathbb{C}))$ represents a topological invariant. Note that the map (4.42) is contractible to the group of maps from \mathbf{S}^p to $U(N)$ [48].

If we think of $GL(N, \mathbb{C})$ as an endomorphism from \mathbb{C}^N to itself, \mathbb{C}^N is already big enough to embed \mathbf{S}^p into it if $N > p/2$. This leads to a remarkable point that there is the so-called stable regime at $N > p/2$ where $\pi_p(GL(N, \mathbb{C}))$ is independent of N . In this stable regime, the homotopy groups of $GL(N, \mathbb{C})$ or $U(N)$ define a generalized cohomology theory, known as K-theory [46, 47, 48, 49]. In K-theory which also involves vector bundles and gauge fields, any smooth manifold X is assigned an Abelian group $K(X)$. Aside from a deep relation to D-brane charges and RR fields in string theory [47, 48], the K-theory is also deeply connected with the theory of Dirac operators, index theorem, Riemannian geometry, noncommutative geometry, etc. [11].

The matrix action (3.21) describes a $U(N \rightarrow \infty)$ vector (Chan-Paton) bundle supported on \mathbf{R}_C^d . The homotopy map (4.42) is to classify stable solutions of the $U(N)$ Chan-Paton bundle that cannot be dissipated by small perturbations. But the topological classification should be defined up to pair creations and pair annihilations because there is no way to suppress such quantum effects. This is the reason [48, 49] why $K(X)$ is the right answer to classify the topological class of excitations in the $U(N)$ gauge-Higgs system. For X noncompact, $K(X)$ is to be interpreted as compact K-theory [46]. For example, for $X = \mathbf{R}^d$, this group is given by

$$K(\mathbf{R}^d) = \pi_{d-1}(GL(N, \mathbb{C})) \quad (4.43)$$

with N in the stable regime. The corresponding groups are known to exhibit the Bott periodicity such that $K(\mathbf{R}^d) = \mathbb{Z}$ for even d and $K(\mathbf{R}^d) = 0$ for odd d .

With the above understanding, let us find an explicit construction of a topologically non-trivial excitation. It is well-known [49] that this can be done using an elegant construction due to Atiyah, Bott

and Shapiro (ABS) [50]. The construction uses the gamma matrices of the Lorentz group $SO(p, 1)$ for $X = \mathbf{R}_C^d$ to construct explicit generators of the K-theory group in (4.43) where $p = d - 1$. Let X be even dimensional so that $K(X) = \mathbf{Z}$ and S_\pm be two irreducible spinor representations of $Spin(d)$ Lorentz group and $p_\mu = (\omega, \mathbf{p})$, $\mu = 0, 1, \dots, p$, be the momenta along X . We define the gamma matrices $\Gamma^\mu : S_+ \rightarrow S_-$ of $SO(p, 1)$ to satisfy $\{\Gamma^\mu, \Gamma^\nu\} = 2\eta^{\mu\nu}$. Also we introduce an operator $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{H} \times S_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \times S_-$ [71] such that

$$\mathcal{D} = \Gamma^\mu p_\mu + \dots \quad (4.44)$$

which is regarded as a linear operator acting on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} as well as the spinor vector space S_\pm . Here the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is possibly much smaller than the Fock space (1.18), because the Dirac operator (4.44) acts on collective (coarse-grained) modes of the solution (4.42).

The ABS construction implies [71, 72] that the Dirac operator (4.44) is a generator of $\pi_p(U(N))$ as a nontrivial topology in momentum space (\mathbf{p}, ω) and acts on low lying excitations near the vacuum (3.22) which carry K-theory charges and so are stable. Such modes are described by coarse-grained fermions $\chi^A(\omega, \mathbf{p}, \theta)$ with θ denoting possible collective coordinates of the solution (4.42) [71]. The ABS construction determines the range \tilde{N} of the index A carried by the coarse-grained fermions χ^A to be $\tilde{N} = 2^{[p/2]}n \leq N$ complex components. The precise form of the fermion χ^A depends on its K-theory charge whose explicit representation on $\mathcal{H} \times S_\pm$ will be determined later. The Feynman's approach [42] in Section 4.1 will provide a clear-cut picture to see what the multiplicity n means. At low energies, the dispersion relation of the fermion χ^A is given by the relativistic Dirac equation

$$i\Gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \chi + \dots = 0 \quad (4.45)$$

with possible gauge interactions and higher order corrections in higher energies. Thus we get a spinor of the Lorentz group $SO(p, 1)$ from the ABS construction as a topological solution in momentum space [71]. For example, in four dimensions, i.e., $p = 3$, χ^A has two complex components when $n = 1$ and so it describes a chiral Weyl fermion.

Although the emergence of $(p + 1)$ -dimensional spinors is just a consequence due to the fact that the ABS construction uses the Clifford algebra to construct explicit generators of $\pi_p(U(N))$, its physical origin is mysterious and difficult to understand. But we believe that the coherent spacetime vacuum (1.17) would be the crux for the origin of the fermionic nature of particles and the mysterious connection between the Clifford module and K-theory [50]. It should be an important future problem to clearly understand this issue.

Now let us address the problem to determine the multiplicity n of the coarse-grained fermions $\chi^{\alpha a}$ where we decomposed the index $A = (\alpha a)$ with α the spinor index of the $SO(d)$ Lorentz group and $a = 1, \dots, n$ an internal index of an n -dimensional representation of some compact symmetry G . In order to understand this problem, we will identify the noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ with $GL(N, \mathbf{C})$ using the relation (1.22). Under this correspondence, the $U(N \rightarrow \infty)$ gauge theory (3.21) in the Moyal background (3.22) can be mapped to the D -dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory

(3.31) defined on $\mathbf{R}_C^d \times \mathbf{R}_{NC}^{2n}$ where $D = d + 2n$. Then the K-theory (4.43) for any sufficiently large N can be identified with the K-theory $K(\mathcal{A}_\theta)$ for the noncommutative \star -algebra \mathcal{A}_θ [48].

As we showed in Section 3.2, a generic fluctuation in Eq.(3.33) will deform the background space-time lattice defined by the Fock space (1.18) and it generates gravitational fields given by the metric (3.39). For simplicity, we will consider low energy excitations around the solution (4.42) whose K-theory class is given by $K(\mathcal{A}_\theta)$. But the solution (4.42) would be a sufficiently localized state described by a compact (bounded self-adjoint) operator in \mathcal{A}_θ . This means that it does not appreciably disturb the ambient gravitational field. Therefore we may reduce the problem to a quantum particle dynamics on $X \times F$ [5] where $X = \mathbf{R}_C^d$ and F is an internal space describing collective modes of the solution (4.42). It is natural to identify the coordinate of F with an internal charge of G carried by the fermion $\chi^{\alpha a}$. To be specific, the (collective) coordinates of F will take values in the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G such as the isospins or colors and will be denoted by Q^I ($I = 1, \dots, n^2 - 1$). In the end we essentially revisit the Feynman's problem we addressed in Section 4.1.

The quantum particle dynamics on $X \times F$ naturally requires to introduce non-Abelian gauge fields in the representation of the Lie algebra (4.16). And the dynamics of the particle carrying an internal charge in F will be defined by a symplectic structure on $T^*X \times F$. Note that \mathbf{R}_{NC}^{2n} already has its symplectic structure $B = \frac{1}{2}B_{ab}dy^a \wedge dy^b$ which is the precursor of the noncommutative space (3.24). Also note that the action (3.31) has only $U(1)$ gauge fields on $\mathbf{R}_C^d \times \mathbf{R}_{NC}^{2n}$. So the problem is how to get the Lie algebra generators in Eq.(4.16) from the space \mathbf{R}_{NC}^{2n} and how to get the non-Abelian gauge fields $A_\mu^I(z) \in \mathfrak{g}$ on X from the $U(1)$ gauge fields on $\mathbf{R}_C^d \times \mathbf{R}_{NC}^{2n}$. Here it is enough to consider the transverse gauge fields $A_\mu^I(z)$ only as low lying excitations because the solution (4.42) is actually coming from the longitudinal gauge field $\hat{A}_a(z, y)$ in (3.27).

The problem is solved [5] by noting that the n -dimensional harmonic oscillator in quantum mechanics can realize $SU(n)$ symmetries (see the Chapter 14 in [73]). The generators of the $SU(n)$ symmetry on the Fock space (1.18) are given by

$$Q^I = a_i^\dagger T_{ik}^I a_k \quad (4.46)$$

where the creation and annihilation operators are given by Eq.(1.17) and T^I 's are constant $n \times n$ matrices satisfying $[T^I, T^J] = if^{IJ}_K T^K$ with the same structure constants as (4.16). It is easy to check that the Q^I 's satisfy the $SU(n)$ Lie algebra (4.16). We introduce the number operator $Q^0 \equiv a_i^\dagger a_i$ and identify with a $U(1)$ generator. The operator $\mathfrak{C} = \sum_I Q^I Q^I$ is the quadratic Casimir operator of the $SU(n)$ Lie algebra and commutes with all Q^I 's. Thus one may identify \mathfrak{C} with an additional $U(1)$ generator.

Let $\rho(\mathcal{H})$ be a representation of the Lie algebra (4.16) in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . We take an n -dimensional representation in $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{C}^n)$, a square integrable Hilbert space. Since the solution (4.42) is described by a compact operator in \mathcal{A}_θ , its representation space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{C}^n)$ will be much smaller (with finite basis in generic cases) than the original Fock space (1.18). So let us expand the

$U(1)$ gauge field $\hat{A}_\mu(z, y)$ in Eq.(3.27) with the $SU(n)$ basis (4.46)

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{A}_\mu(z, y) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{I_i \in \rho(\mathcal{H})} A_\mu^{I_1 \dots I_n}(z, \rho, \lambda_n) Q^{I_1} \dots Q^{I_n} \\ &= A_\mu(z) + A_\mu^I(z, \rho, \lambda_1) Q^I + A_\mu^{IJ}(z, \rho, \lambda_2) Q^I Q^J + \dots\end{aligned}\quad (4.47)$$

where ρ and λ_n are eigenvalues of Q^0 and \mathfrak{C} , respectively, in the representation $\rho(\mathcal{H})$. The expansion (4.47) is formal but it is assumed that each term in Eq.(4.47) belongs to the irreducible representation of $\rho(\mathcal{H})$. Through the expansion (4.47), we get $SU(n)$ gauge fields $A_\mu^I(z)$ as well as $U(1)$ gauge fields $A_\mu(z)$ as low lying excitations [5].

Note that the coarse-grained fermion χ in Eq.(4.45) behaves as a stable relativistic particle in the spacetime $X = \mathbb{R}_C^d$. When these fermionic excitations are given, there will also be bosonic excitations arising from changing the position in X of the internal charge F . According to the Feynman's picture, especially the Wong's equation (4.19), the gauge fields in Eq.(4.47) represent collective modes for the position change in $X = \mathbb{R}_C^d$ of the charge F [72]. See Eq.(4.21) for the geometrical interpretation of the Wong's equation (4.19). Thus they can be regarded as collective modes in the vicinity of an internal charge living in F and interact with the fermions in Eq.(4.45).

Therefore we think of the Dirac operator (4.44) as an operator $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{H} \times S_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \times S_-$ where $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{C}^n)$ and introduce a minimal coupling with the $U(1)$ and $SU(n)$ gauge fields in Eq.(4.47) by the replacement $p_\mu \rightarrow p_\mu - eA_\mu - A_\mu^I Q^I$. Then the Dirac equation (4.45) becomes

$$i\Gamma^\mu(\partial_\mu - ieA_\mu - iA_\mu^I Q^I)\chi + \dots = 0. \quad (4.48)$$

Here we see that the coarse-grained fermion χ in the homotopy class $\pi_p(U(N))$ is in the fundamental representation of $SU(n)$. So we identify the multiplicity n in the ABS construction (4.45) with the number of colors in $SU(n)$ [5].

The most interesting case in (3.31) is of $d = 4$ and $n = 3$, that is, 10-dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory on $\mathbb{R}_C^4 \times \mathbb{R}_{NC}^6$. In this case Eq.(4.48) is the 4-dimensional Dirac equation where χ is a quark, an $SU(3)$ multiplet of chiral Weyl fermions, which couples with gluons $A_\mu^I(z)$, $SU(3)$ gauge fields for the color charge Q^I , as well as photons $A_\mu(z)$, $U(1)$ gauge fields for the electric charge e . One may consider a similar ABS construction in the vector space $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}^3$, i.e., by breaking the $SU(3)$ symmetry into $SU(2) \times U(1)$ where χ would be a lepton, an $SU(2)$ doublet of chiral Weyl fermions coupling with $SU(2)$ gauge fields. In this case Q^I ($I = 1, 2, 3$) in Eq.(4.46) are the famous Schwinger representation of $SU(2)$ Lie algebra.

To conclude, we may go back to our starting point. Our starting point was the d -dimensional $U(N)$ Yang-Mills theory defined by the action (3.21) or equivalently D -dimensional noncommutative $U(1)$ gauge theory defined by the action (3.31). We observed that the theory (3.21) allows topologically stable solutions as long as the homotopy group (4.42) is nontrivial. And we argued that a matter field such as leptons and quarks simply arises from such a stable solution and non-Abelian gauge fields

correspond to collective zero-modes of the stable localized solution. Although we intended to interpret such excitations as particles and gauge fields and ignored their gravitational effects, we have to remind that these are originally a part of spacetime geometry according to the map (3.33). Consequently we get a remarkable picture, if any, that matter fields such as leptons and quarks simply arise as a stable localized geometry, which is a topological object in the defining algebra (noncommutative \star -algebra) of quantum gravity.

5 Anatomy of Spacetime

It is in order to discuss the most beautiful aspects of emergent gravity. Remarkably the emergent gravity reveals a noble picture about the origin of spacetime, dubbed as emergent spacetime, which is radically different from any previous physical theory all of which describe what happens in a given spacetime. So we may take it for granted that emergent gravity leads to many radically different results from Einstein gravity.

5.1 Emergent time in emergent gravity

We have intentionally postponed to pose the formidable issue how “Time” emerges together with spaces and how it is entangled with the space to unfold into a single entity - spacetime and to take the shape of Lorentz covariance. Now we are ready to address this formidable issue.

Let (M, π) be a Poisson manifold. We previously defined the anchor map $\pi^\sharp : T^*M \rightarrow TM$ in (3.94) for a general Poisson bivector $\pi \in \bigwedge^2 T^*M$ and the Hamiltonian vector field (3.95) by

$$X_H \equiv -\pi^\sharp(dH) = \{\cdot, H\}_\pi = \pi^{\mu\nu}(x) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x^\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}, \quad (5.1)$$

where $H : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function on the Poisson manifold (M, π) . If the Poisson tensor π is nondegenerate so that $\pi^{-1} \equiv \omega \in \bigwedge^2 T^*M$ is a symplectic structure on M , the anchor map $\pi^\sharp : T^*M \rightarrow TM$ defines a bundle isomorphism because π^\sharp is nondegenerate everywhere. We will speak of the flow ϕ_t of a vector field X on M when referring to 1-parameter group of diffeomorphisms $M \rightarrow M$ generated by X .

Any Poisson manifold (M, π) always admits a Hamiltonian dynamical system on M defined by a Hamiltonian vector field X_H and it is described by

$$\frac{df}{dt} = X_H(f) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \{f, H\}_\pi + \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \quad (5.2)$$

for any $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times M)$. If ϕ_t is a flow generated by a Hamiltonian vector field X_H , the following

identity holds [6]

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}(f \circ \phi_t) &= \frac{d}{dt}\phi_t^* f = \phi_t^* \mathcal{L}_{X_H} f + \phi_t^* \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \\
&= \phi_t^* \{f, H\}_\pi + \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \circ \phi_t \\
&= \left(\{f, H\}_\pi + \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right) \circ \phi_t.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Thus we can get $f(x, t) = g(\phi_t(x))$ where $g(x) \equiv f(x, 0)$. If $\pi = \eta = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}$, we precisely reproduce (4.30) and (4.31) from (5.2) and (5.3), respectively. In this case the evolution of a particle system is described by the dynamical flow (5.3) generated by the Hamiltonian vector field (5.1) for a given Hamiltonian H .

Introduce an extended Poisson tensor on $\mathbf{R} \times M$ [6]

$$\tilde{\pi} = \pi + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial H} \tag{5.4}$$

and a generalized Hamiltonian vector field

$$\tilde{X}_H \equiv -\tilde{\pi}^\sharp(dH) = \{\cdot, H\}_{\tilde{\pi}} = \pi^{\mu\nu}(x) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x^\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}. \tag{5.5}$$

We can then rewrite the Hamilton's equation (5.2) compactly as the form

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \tilde{X}_H(f) = \{f, H\}_{\tilde{\pi}} = \{f, H\}_\pi + \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}. \tag{5.6}$$

Similarly, we can extend the symplectic structure $\omega = \pi^{-1}$ to the product manifold $\mathbf{R} \times M$ by considering a new symplectic structure $\tilde{\omega} = \pi_2^* \omega$ where $\pi_2 : \mathbf{R} \times M \rightarrow M$ is the projection such that $\pi_2(t, x) = x$. Define $\omega_H = \tilde{\omega} + dH \wedge dt$. Then the pair $(\mathbf{R} \times M, \omega_H)$ is called a contact manifold [6].

Supposed that observables $f \in C^\infty(M)$ do not depend on time explicitly, i.e., $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = 0$. Look at the equation (5.3). We figure out the time evolution of the system in this case is determined by simply calculating the Poisson bracket with a Hamiltonian function H . In other words, in the case of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = 0$, the time evolution is just the inner automorphism of Poisson algebra $(M, \{\cdot, \cdot\}_\pi)$.¹¹ Therefore, the time in the Hamilton's equation (5.2) is basically an affine parameter to trace out the history of a particle and it is operationally defined by the Hamiltonian. That is, the time in the Hamiltonian dynamics is intrinsically the history of particles themselves. But we have to notice that, only when the symplectic structure is fixed for a given Hamiltonian, the evolution of the system is completely determined by the evolution equation (5.3). In this case the dynamics of the system can be formulated in terms of an evolution with a single time parameter. In other words, we have a globally well-defined time for the evolution of the system. This is the usual situation we consider in classical mechanics.

¹¹ One may imagine that the system (5.2) is quantized *a la* (1.5). Then the time evolution of a quantum system is derived from a Heisenberg algebra, i.e., $i\hbar \frac{d\hat{f}}{dt} = [\hat{f}, \hat{H}]$ for $\hat{f}, \hat{H} \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar$. This is also in the line of our philosophy that a geometry is derived from an algebra.

But, if observables $f \in C^\infty(M)$ including the Hamiltonian H explicitly depend on time, i.e., $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \neq 0$, the time evolution of the system is not completely determined by the inner automorphism of the Poisson algebra only. So the time evolution partially becomes an outer automorphism. However, as we remarked above, we can extend an underlying Poisson structure like as (5.4) or introduce a contact manifold $(\mathbb{R} \times M, \omega_H)$ by extending an underlying symplectic structure. The time evolution of a particle system is again defined by an inner automorphism of extended Poisson algebra $(\mathbb{R} \times M, \{\cdot, \cdot\}_\pi)$. But in this case the time should be regarded as a dynamical variable whose conjugate momentum is given by the Hamiltonian H as indicated by the Poisson structure (5.4). So the time should be defined locally in this case. Let us clarify this situation.

Consider a dynamical evolution described by the change of a symplectic structure from ω to $\omega_t = \omega + t(\omega' - \omega)$ for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$ where $\omega' - \omega = -edA$. The Moser lemma (2.5) says that there always exists a one-parameter family of diffeomorphisms generated by a smooth time-dependent vector field X_t satisfying $\iota_{X_t}\omega_t = eA$. Although the vector field X_t defines a dynamical one-parameter flow, the vector field X_t is in general not even locally Hamiltonian because $dA \neq 0$. The evolution of the system in this case is locally described by the flow ϕ_t of X_t starting at $F_0 = \text{identity}$ but it is no more a (locally) Hamiltonian flow. In this case we fail to have the property $\mathcal{L}_{X_t}f = \{f, H\}_\pi$ in (5.3) and so we have no global Hamiltonian flow. That is, there is no well-defined or global time for the particle system. In other words, the time flow ϕ_t of X_t defined on a local chart describes only a local evolution of the system.

We observed the equivalence (4.41) for the dynamics of a charged particle. Let us consider the above situation by looking at the left-hand side picture of (4.41) by fixing the symplectic structure but instead changing the Hamiltonian. (Note that the magnetic field in the Lorentz force (4.35) does not do any work. So there is no energy flow during the evolution.) At time $t = 0$, the system is described by the free Hamiltonian H_0 but it ends up with the Hamiltonian (4.32) at time $t = 1$. Therefore the dynamics of the system cannot be described with a single time parameter covering the entire period $0 \leq t \leq 1$. We can introduce at most a local time during $\delta t < \epsilon$ on a local patch and smoothly adjust to a neighboring patch. To say, a clock of the particle will tick each time with a different rate because the Hamiltonian of the particle is changing during time evolution. As we already remarked before, we may also need to quantize the time according to the Poisson structure (5.4) in order to describe a quantum evolution of a system in terms of an extended inner automorphism such as (5.6).

Now we can apply the same philosophy to the case of the Poisson structure (1.6) defined on a space itself [5]. The mathematics is exactly the same. An essential point to define the time evolution of a system was that any Poisson manifold (M, π) always admits the Hamiltonian dynamical system (5.2) on M defined by the Hamiltonian vector field X_H given by (5.1). We have faced the same situation with the θ -bracket (1.6) whose time evolution was summarized in Eq.(2.5). Of course one should avoid a confusion between the dynamical evolution of particle system related to the phase space (1.4) and the dynamical evolution of spacetime geometry related to the noncommutative space (1.6).

We would get an important lesson from Souriau and Sternberg [45] that the Hamiltonian dynamics in the presence of electromagnetic fields can be described by the deformation of symplectic structure of phase space. More precisely, we observed that the emergent geometry is defined by a one-parameter family of diffeomorphisms generated by a smooth vector field X_t satisfying $\iota_{X_t}\omega_t + A = 0$ for the change of a symplectic structure within the same cohomology class from ω to $\omega_t = \omega + t(\omega' - \omega)$ for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$ where $\omega' - \omega = dA$. The vector field X_t is in general not a Hamiltonian flow, so any global time cannot be assigned to the evolution of the symplectic structure ω_t . But, if there is no fluctuation of symplectic structure, i.e., $F = dA = 0$ or $A = -dH$, there can be a globally well-defined Hamiltonian flow. In this case we can define a global time by introducing a unique Hamiltonian such that the time evolution is defined by $df/dt = X_H(f) = \{f, H\}_{\theta=\omega^{-1}}$ everywhere. In particular, when the initial symplectic structure ω is constant (homogeneous), a clock will tick everywhere at the same rate. Note that this situation happens for the constant background (1.17) from which a flat spacetime emerges as we will discuss soon in some detail. But, if ω is not constant, the time evolution will not be uniform over the space and a clock will tick at the different rate at different places. This is consistent with Einstein gravity because a nonconstant ω corresponds to a curved space in our picture, as we explained in Section 3.4.

In the case of changing a symplectic structure, we can apply the same strategy as the particle case with the Poisson structure $\pi = \theta$. So we suggest in general the concept of “Time” in emergent gravity [5] as a contact manifold $(\mathbf{R} \times M, \omega_H)$ where (M, ω) is a symplectic manifold and $\omega_H = \tilde{\omega} + dH \wedge dt$ with $\tilde{\omega} = \pi_2^*\omega$ defined by the projection $\pi_2 : \mathbf{R} \times M \rightarrow M$, $\pi_2(t, x) = x$. A question is then how to recover the (local) Lorentz symmetry in the end. As we pointed out above, if (M, ω) is a canonical symplectic manifold, i.e., $M = \mathbf{R}^{2n}$ and $\omega = \text{constant}$, a $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional Lorentz symmetry appears from the contact manifold $(\mathbf{R} \times M, \omega_H)$. (For a more general case such as our $(3 + 1)$ -dimensional Lorentzian world and a Poisson spacetime (3.93), we can instead use the Poisson structure in (5.4)-(5.6). Or we may need even more general argument, which we don’t know yet, for the situation we mentioned in the paragraph above (3.67).) Once again, the Darboux theorem says that there always exists a local coordinate system where the symplectic structure is of the canonical form. See Eq.(2.7). For the Poisson case, we can apply the Weinstein’s splitting theorem instead. See the paragraph in (3.93). Then it is quite plausible that the local Lorentz symmetry would be recovered in the previous way on a local Darboux chart. Furthermore, the Feynman’s argument in Section 4.1 implies that the gauge symmetry as well as the Lorentz symmetry is just derived from the symplectic structure on the contact manifold $(\mathbf{R} \times M, \omega_H)$. For example, one can recover the gauge symmetry along the time direction by defining the Hamiltonian $H = A_0 + H'$ and the time evolution of a spacetime geometry by the Hamilton’s equation $D_0 f \equiv df/dt + \{A_0, f\}_{\tilde{\theta}=\tilde{\omega}^{-1}} = \{f, H'\}_{\tilde{\theta}=\tilde{\omega}^{-1}}$. And then one may interpret the Hamilton’s equation as the infinitesimal version of an inner automorphism like (3.33), which was indeed used to define the vector field $V_0(X)$ in (3.34).

Our proposal for the emergent time [5] is based on the fact that a symplectic manifold (M, ω) always admits a Hamiltonian dynamical system on M defined by a Hamiltonian vector field X_H ,

i.e., $\iota_{X_H}\omega = dH$. The emergent time can be generalized to the noncommutative space (1.8) by considering the inner derivation (3.14) instead of the Poisson bracket $\{f, H\}_\theta$. If time is emergent in this way, it also implies a very interesting consequence. Note that every symplectic manifold (M, B) is canonically oriented and comes with a canonical measure, the Liouville measure, $B^n = \frac{1}{n!}B \wedge \cdots \wedge B$, which is a volume form of symplectic manifold (M, B) and nowhere vanishing on M . Therefore the symplectic structure B triggered by the vacuum condensate (3.68) not only causes the emergence of spacetime but also specifies an orientation of the spacetime. Because the time evolution of the spacetime is defined by the Poisson structure $\pi = \theta = B^{-1}$ as in (5.3), overall time evolution of the spacetime manifold will have a direction depending on the orientation B^n although a local time evolution has the time reversal symmetry. If gravity is emergent from the electromagnetism supported on a symplectic manifold as we have devised so far, it may be possible to explain the “arrow of time” in the cosmic evolution of our Universe - the most notoriously difficult problem in quantum gravity.

5.2 Cosmological constant problem and dark energy

In general relativity, gravitation arises out of the dynamics of spacetime being curved by the presence of stress-energy and the equations of motion for the metric fields of spacetime are determined by the distribution of matter and energy:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4}T_{\mu\nu}. \quad (5.7)$$

The Einstein equations (5.7) describe how the geometry of spacetime on the left-hand side is determined dynamically, at first sight, in harmony with matter fields on the right-hand side. We know that the existence of spacetime leads to a “metrical elasticity” of space, i.e., to an inertial force which opposes the curving of space.

However there is a deep conflict between the spacetime geometry described by general relativity and matter fields described by quantum field theory. If spacetime is flat, i.e., $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu}$, the left-hand side of Eq.(5.7) identically vanishes and so the energy-momentum tensor of matter fields should vanish, i.e., $T_{\mu\nu} = 0$. In other words, a flat spacetime is free gratis, i.e., costs no energy. But the concept of empty space in Einstein gravity is in an acute contrast to the concept of vacuum in quantum field theory where the vacuum is not empty but full of quantum fluctuations. As a result, the vacuum is extremely heavy whose weight is roughly of Planck mass, i.e., $\rho_{\text{vac}} \sim M_P^4$.

The conflict rises to the surface that gravity and matters respond differently to the vacuum energy and perplexingly brings about the notorious cosmological constant problem. Indeed the clash manifests itself as a mismatch of symmetry between gravity and matters [74]. To be precise, if we shift a matter Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_M by a constant Λ , that is,

$$\mathcal{L}_M \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_M - 2\Lambda, \quad (5.8)$$

it results in the shift of the matter energy-momentum tensor by $T_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow T_{\mu\nu} - \Lambda g_{\mu\nu}$ in the Einstein equation (5.7) although the equations of motion for matters are invariant under the shift (5.8). Defi-

ninitely the Λ -term in Eq.(5.8) will appear as the cosmological constant in Einstein gravity and it affects the spacetime structure. For example, a flat spacetime is no longer a solution of (5.7).

Let us sharpen the problem arising from the conflict between the geometry and matters. In quantum field theory there is no way to suppress quantum fluctuations in a vacuum. Fortunately the vacuum energy due to the quantum fluctuations, regardless of how large it is, does not make any trouble to quantum field theory thanks to the symmetry (5.8). However the general covariance requires that gravity couples universally to all kinds of energy. Therefore the vacuum energy $\rho_{\text{vac}} \sim M_P^4$ will induce a highly curved spacetime whose curvature scale R would be $\sim M_P^2$ according to (5.7). If so, the quantum field theory framework in the background of quantum fluctuations must be broken down due to a large back-reaction of background spacetime. But we know that it is not the case. The quantum field theory is well-defined in the presence of the vacuum energy $\rho_{\text{vac}} \sim M_P^4$ and the background spacetime still remains flat. So far there is no experimental evidence for the vacuum energy to really couple to gravity while it is believed that the vacuum energy is real as experimentally verified by the Casimir effect.

Which side of Eq.(5.7) is the culprit giving rise to the incompatibility? After consolidating all the suspicions inferred above, we throw a doubt on the left-hand side of Eq.(5.7), especially, on the result that a flat spacetime is free gratis, i.e., costs no energy. It would be remarked that such a result is not compatible with the inflation scenario either which shows that a huge vacuum energy in a highly nonequilibrium state is required to generate an extremely large spacetime. Note that Einstein gravity is not completely background independent because it assumes the prior existence of a spacetime manifold.¹² In particular, the flat spacetime is a geometry of special relativity rather than general relativity and so it is assumed to be *a priori* given without reference to its dynamical origin. This reasoning implies that the negligence about the dynamical origin of flat spacetime defining a local inertial frame in general relativity might be a core root of the incompatibility inherent in Eq.(5.7).

All in all, one may be tempted to infer that a flat spacetime may be not free gratis but a result of Planck energy condensation in a vacuum. Now we will show that inference is true [37]. Surprisingly, the emergent spacetime picture then appears as the Hóly Gráil to cure several notorious problems in theoretical physics; for example, to resolve the cosmological constant problem, to understand the nature of dark energy and to explain why gravity is so weak compared to other forces. After all, our final pinpoint is to check whether the emergent gravity from noncommutative geometry is a physically viable theory to correctly explain the dynamical origin of flat spacetime.

Let us start with a background independent matrix theory, for example, (3.3) or (3.59), where any spacetime structure is not introduced. A specific spacetime background, viz., a flat spacetime, has been defined by specifying the vacuum (3.22) of the theory. Now look at the metric (2.67) or (3.39) to trace back where the flat spacetime comes from. The flat spacetime is the case with $V_a^\mu = \delta_a^\mu$, so $\lambda^2 = 1$. The vector field $V_a = V_a^\mu \partial_\mu = \partial_a$ for this case is coming from the noncommutative

¹²Here we refer to a background independent theory where any spacetime structure is not *a priori* assumed but defined by the theory.

gauge field $A_a^{(0)} \equiv \langle \hat{A}_a^{(0)} \rangle_{\text{vac}} = -B_{ab}y^b$ in (3.69) whose field strength is $\langle \hat{F}_{ab}^{(0)} \rangle_{\text{vac}} = -B_{ab}$, describing a uniform condensation of gauge fields in vacuum. See Eq.(3.68). Therefore we see that the flat spacetime is emergent from the vacuum algebra (1.8) induced by a uniform condensation of gauge fields in vacuum. This is a tangible difference from Einstein gravity where the flat spacetime is completely an empty space.

The emergent gravity defined by the action (3.31), for example, responds completely differently to the constant shift (5.8). To be specific, let us consider a constant shift of the background $B_{MN} \rightarrow B_{MN} + \delta B_{MN}$. Then the action (3.31) in the new background becomes

$$\hat{S}_{B+\delta B} = \hat{S}_B + \frac{1}{2g_{YM}^2} \int d^D X \hat{F}_{MN} \delta B_{MN} - \frac{1}{4g_{YM}^2} \int d^D X \left(\delta B_{MN}^2 - 2B^{MN} \delta B_{MN} \right). \quad (5.9)$$

The last term in Eq.(5.9) is simply a constant and thus it will not affect the equations of motion (3.49). The second term is a total derivative and so it will vanish if $\int d^D X \hat{F}_{MN} = 0$. (It is a defining property [7] in the definition of a star product that $\int d^D X \hat{f} \star \hat{g} = \int d^D X \hat{f} \cdot \hat{g}$. Then the second term should vanish as far as $\hat{A}_M \rightarrow 0$ at infinity.) If spacetime has a nontrivial boundary, the second term could be nonvanishing at the boundary, which will change the theory under the shift. We will not consider a nontrivial spacetime boundary because the boundary term is not an essential issue here, though there would be an interesting physics at the boundary. Then we get the result $\hat{S}_{B+\delta B} \cong \hat{S}_B$. Indeed this is the Seiberg-Witten equivalence between noncommutative field theories defined by the noncommutativity $\theta' = \frac{1}{B+\delta B}$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{B}$ [10]. Although the vacuum (3.68) readjusts itself under the shift, the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{\theta'}$ and \mathcal{H}_{θ} in (1.18) are completely isomorphic if and only if θ and θ' are nondegenerate constants. Furthermore the vector fields in (3.33) generated by $B + \delta B$ and B backgrounds are equally flat as long as they are constant. Consequently two different constant backgrounds are related by a global Lorentz transformation. Eq.(2.99) also shows that the background gauge field does not contribute to the energy-momentum tensor in Eq.(2.103).

Therefore we clearly see that the constant shift of energy density such as (5.8) is a symmetry of the theory (3.31) although the action (3.31) defines a theory of gravity in the sense of emergent gravity. As a consequence, *there is no cosmological constant problem in emergent gravity* [37]. Now let us estimate the dynamical scale of the vacuum condensation (3.68). Because gravity emerges from noncommutative gauge fields, the parameters, g_{YM}^2 and $|\theta|$, defining a noncommutative gauge theory should be related to the Newton constant G in emergent gravity. A simple dimensional analysis leads to the relation (2.105). This relation immediately leads to the fact [5] that the energy density of the vacuum (3.68) is

$$\rho_{\text{vac}} \sim |B_{ab}|^2 \sim M_P^4 \quad (5.10)$$

where $M_P = (8\pi G)^{-1/2} \sim 10^{18} \text{GeV}$ is the Planck mass. Therefore the emergent gravity finally reveals a remarkable picture that the huge Planck energy M_P is actually the origin of a flat spacetime. Hence we conclude that *a vacuum energy does not gravitate unlike as Einstein gravity and a flat spacetime is not free gratis but a result of Planck energy condensation in vacuum* [37].

If the vacuum algebra (1.8) describes a flat spacetime, it can have a very important implication to cosmology. According to our picture for emergent spacetime, a flat spacetime is emergent from the Planck energy condensation in vacuum and thus the time scale for the condensate will be roughly of Planck time. And we know that there was an epoch of very violent time varying vacuum, the so-called cosmic inflation. Therefore it is natural to expect that an explosive inflation era lasted roughly 10^{-33} seconds at the beginning of our Universe corresponds to a dynamical process for the instantaneous condensation of vacuum energy $\rho_{\text{vac}} \sim M_P^4$ to enormously spread out a flat spacetime. Of course it is not clear how to microscopically describe this dynamical process using the matrix action (3.59). Nevertheless it is quite obvious that the cosmological inflation should be the dynamical condensation of the vacuum energy $\rho_{\text{vac}} \sim M_P^4$ for the emergence of (flat) spacetime according to our emergent gravity picture.

In addition, our picture for the emergent spacetime implies that the global Lorentz symmetry should be a perfect symmetry up to Planck energy because the flat spacetime was emergent from the Planck energy condensation in vacuum - the maximum energy in Nature. The huge vacuum energy $\rho_{\text{vac}} \sim |B_{ab}|^2 \sim M_P^4$ was simply used to make a flat spacetime and so, surprisingly, does not gravitate [37] ! Then the gravitational fields generated by the deformations of the background (3.68) will be very weak because the spacetime vacuum is very solid with a stiffness of the Planck scale. So the dynamical origin of flat spacetime is intimately related to the weakness of gravitational force. Furthermore, the vacuum algebra (1.17) describes an extremely coherent condensation because it is equal to the Heisenberg algebra of n -dimensional quantum harmonic oscillator. As a consequence, the noncommutative algebra (1.17) should describe a *zero entropy state* in spite of the involvement of Planck energy. It is very mysterious but it should be the case because a flat spacetime emergent from the algebra (1.17) is completely an empty space from the viewpoint of Einstein gravity and so has no entropy. This reasoning also implies that the condensation of vacuum energy $\rho_{\text{vac}} \sim M_P^4$ happened at most only once.

We observed that the dynamical scale of the vacuum condensate is of the Planck scale. The emergence of spacetime was arisen by accumulating Planck energy in vacuum. But the Planck energy condensation causes the underlying spacetime to be noncommutative, which will introduce an uncertainty relation between microscopic spacetime. Therefore, a further accumulation of energy over the noncommutative spacetime will be subject to the UV/IR mixing [75]. The UV/IR mixing in the noncommutative spacetime then implies that any UV fluctuations of the Planck scale L_P will be necessarily paired with IR fluctuations of a typical scale L_H . These vacuum fluctuations around the flat spacetime will add a tiny energy $\delta\rho$ to the vacuum (5.10) so that the total energy density is equal to $\rho \sim M_P^4 + \delta\rho$. A simple dimensional analysis and a symmetry consideration, e.g., the cosmological principle, lead to the estimation of the vacuum fluctuation [74]

$$\rho = \rho_{\text{vac}} + \delta\rho \sim M_P^4 \left(1 + \frac{L_P^2}{L_H^2}\right) = M_P^4 + \frac{1}{L_P^2 L_H^2}. \quad (5.11)$$

It might be remarked that, though the second term in (5.11) is nearly constant within a Hubble patch,

it is not completely constant over the entire spacetime while the first term is a true constant, because the vacuum fluctuation $\delta\rho$ has a finite size of L_H and so it will act as a source of spacetime curvature of the order $1/L_H^2$. Because the first term in ρ does not gravitate, the second term $\delta\rho$ will thus be a leading contribution to the deformation of spacetime curvature, leading to possibly a de Sitter phase. Interestingly this energy of vacuum fluctuations, $\delta\rho \sim \frac{1}{L_P^2 L_H^2}$, is in good agreement with the observed value of current dark energy [74, 37], if L_H is identified with the size of the cosmic horizon of our universe.

As we reasoned above, the existence of the energy $\delta\rho$ in (5.11) seems to be a generic property of emergent gravity based on noncommutative spacetime. Therefore the emergent spacetime would leave the vestige of this energy somewhere. Readers may remember that we discussed some strange energy in Section 2.3. So let us go back to Eq.(2.102). Although we have taken the Euclidean signature to get the result (2.102), we will simply assume that it can be analytically continued to the Lorentzian signature. The Wick rotation will be defined by $y^4 = iy^0$. Under this Wick rotation, $\delta_{ab} \rightarrow \eta_{ab} = (-+++)$ and $\varepsilon^{1234} = 1 \rightarrow -\varepsilon^{0123} = -1$. Then we get $\Psi_a^{(E)} = i\Psi_a^{(L)}$ according to the definition (2.96). It is then given by [5]

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{(L)} = \frac{1}{16\pi G_4 \lambda^2} \left(\rho_\mu \rho_\nu + \Psi_\mu \Psi_\nu - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} (\rho_\lambda^2 + \Psi_\lambda^2) \right) \quad (5.12)$$

where $\rho_\mu = 2\partial_\mu \lambda$ and $\Psi_\mu = E_\mu^a \Psi_a$.

The Raychaudhuri equation [76, 77] is evolution equations of the expansion, shear and rotation of flow lines along the flow generated by a vector field in a background spacetime. Here we introduce an affine parameter τ labeling points on the curve of the flow. Given a timelike unit vector field u^μ , i.e., $u^\mu u_\mu = -1$, the Raychaudhuri equation in four dimensions is given by

$$\dot{\Theta} - \dot{u}^\mu_{;\mu} + \Sigma_{\mu\nu} \Sigma^{\mu\nu} - \Omega_{\mu\nu} \Omega^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{3} \Theta^2 = -R_{\mu\nu} u^\mu u^\nu. \quad (5.13)$$

$\Theta = u^\mu_{;\nu}$ represents the expansion/contraction of volume and $\dot{\Theta} = \frac{d\Theta}{d\tau}$ while $\dot{u}^\mu = u^\mu_{;\nu} u^\nu$ represents the acceleration due to nongravitational forces, e.g., the Lorentz force. $\Sigma_{\mu\nu}$ and $\Omega_{\mu\nu}$ are the shear tensor and the vorticity tensor, respectively, which are all orthogonal to u^μ , i.e., $\Sigma_{\mu\nu} u^\nu = \Omega_{\mu\nu} u^\nu = 0$. The Einstein equation (2.103) can be rewritten as

$$R_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G (T_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} T^\lambda{}_\lambda) \quad (5.14)$$

where $T_{\mu\nu} = E_\mu^a E_\nu^b T_{ab}$. One can see from (5.14) that the right-hand side of (5.13) is given by

$$-R_{\mu\nu} u^\mu u^\nu = -\frac{1}{2\lambda^2} u^\mu u^\nu (\rho_\mu \rho_\nu + \Psi_\mu \Psi_\nu) \quad (5.15)$$

where we considered the energy-momentum tensor (5.12) only for simplicity.

Suppose that all the terms on the left-hand side of Eq.(5.13) except the expansion evolution $\dot{\Theta}$ vanish or become negligible. In this case the Raychaudhuri equation reduces to

$$\dot{\Theta} = -\frac{1}{2\lambda^2} u^\mu u^\nu (\rho_\mu \rho_\nu + \Psi_\mu \Psi_\nu). \quad (5.16)$$

Note that the Ricci scalar is given by $R = \frac{1}{2\lambda^2} g^{\mu\nu} (\rho_\mu \rho_\nu + \Psi_\mu \Psi_\nu)$. Therefore $R < 0$ when ρ_μ and Ψ_μ are timelike while $R > 0$ when they are spacelike. Remember that our metric signature is $(-+++)$. So, for the timelike perturbations, $\dot{\Theta} < 0$ which means that the volume of a three dimensional spacelike hypersurface orthogonal to u_μ decreases. However, if spacelike perturbations are dominant, the volume of the three dimensional spacelike hypersurface can expand. For example, consider the scalar perturbations in (2.107), i.e.,

$$\langle \rho_a \rho_b \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \eta_{ab} \rho_c^2, \quad \langle \Psi_a \Psi_b \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \eta_{ab} \Psi_c^2. \quad (5.17)$$

For spacelike perturbations, Eq.(5.16) becomes

$$\dot{\Theta} = \frac{R}{4} > 0. \quad (5.18)$$

The perturbation (5.17) does not violate the energy condition because $u^\mu u^\nu T_{\mu\nu}^{(L)} = \frac{R}{32\pi G} > 0$ according to (5.12). This means that the Liouville energy-momentum tensor (5.12) can act as a source of gravitational repulsion and exert a negative pressure causing an expansion of universe, possibly leading to a de Sitter phase [77]. As was pointed out in (2.108), it can behave like a cosmological constant, i.e., $\rho = -p$, in a constant (or almost constant) curvature spacetime. Another important property is that the Liouville energy (5.12) is vanishing for the flat spacetime. So it should be small if the spacetime is not so curved.

To be more quantitative, let us consider the fluctuation (5.17) and look at the energy density $u^\mu u^\nu T_{\mu\nu}^{(L)}$ along the flow represented by a timelike unit vector u^μ as in Eq.(5.15). Note that the Riemannian volume is given by $\nu_g = \lambda^2 \nu = \sqrt{-g} d^4 y$. Also it was shown in [5] that Ψ_μ is the Hodge-dual to the 3-form H . Thus $u^\mu \rho_\mu$ and $u^\mu \Psi_\mu$ refer to the volume change of a three dimensional spacelike hypersurface orthogonal to u^μ . Assume that the radius of the three dimensional hypersurface is $L_H(\tau)$ at time τ , where τ is an affine parameter labeling the curve of the flow. Then it is reasonable to expect that $u^\mu \rho_\mu = 2u^\mu \partial_\mu \lambda \approx 2\lambda/L_H(\tau) \approx u^\mu \Psi_\mu$ because the Ricci scalar $R \sim \frac{1}{L_H^2}$. Then we approximately get [5]

$$u^\mu u^\nu T_{\mu\nu}^{(L)} \sim \frac{1}{8\pi G L_H^2} = \frac{1}{L_P^2 L_H^2}. \quad (5.19)$$

If we identify the radius L_H with the size of cosmic horizon, the energy density (5.19) reproduces the dark energy $\delta\rho$ in (5.11) up to a factor.

6 Conclusion and Discussion

We suggested that the quantum gravity must be defined by quantizing spacetime itself by the Newton constant G . This quantization scheme is very different from the conventional one where quantization is basically to quantize an infinite dimensional particle phase space associated with spacetime metric fields in terms of the Planck constant \hbar . Our observation is that the existence of the Newton constant in Nature can be translated into a symplectic or Poisson structure of spacetime and the

canonical quantization of the underlying symplectic or Poisson structure inevitably leads to spacetime noncommutative geometry. It turns out that the electromagnetism defined on the symplectic or Poisson spacetime enjoys very beautiful properties: the Darboux theorem and the Moser lemma. From these theorems, we can formulate the equivalence principle even for the electromagnetic force such that there always exists a coordinate transformation to locally eliminate the electromagnetic force. This equivalence principle could be fully lifted to a noncommutative spacetime and so the so-called “quantum equivalence principle” could be identified as a gauge equivalence between star products. This implies that quantum gravity can consistently be derived from the quantum equivalence principle and matter fields can arise from the quantized spacetime.

If gravity emerges from a field theory, it is necessary to realize the Newton constant G from the field theory. That is the reason why the field theory should be defined with an intrinsic parameter of $(\text{length})^2$ and a noncommutative spacetime elegantly carries out this mission. The only other example of such a theory carrying an intrinsic constant of $(\text{length})^2$ is string theory where α' plays a role of G or $|\theta|$. A unique feature of string theory due to the existence of α' is T-duality [9], which is a symmetry between small and large distances, symbolically represented by $R \leftrightarrow \alpha'/R$. This symmetry implies the existence of minimum length scale in spacetime and so signifies an intrinsic noncommutative spacetime geometry. The T-duality is a crucial ingredient for various string dualities and mirror symmetry. For the very similar reason, the gravity in string theory also basically arises in the context of emergent gravity although many string theorists seem to be reluctant about this interpretation. Recently Blau and Theisen vividly summarize this picture in their review article [78]:

There are basically two approaches to formulate a quantum theory of gravity. The first treats gravity as a fundamental interaction which it attempts to quantise. In the second approach gravity is not fundamental but an emergent phenomenon. String theory falls into the second category. It has the gratifying feature that not only gravity but also the gauge interactions which are mediated by a spin one gauge boson are emergent. String theory thus provides a unifying framework of all elementary particles and their interactions: it inevitably and automatically includes gravity (in the form of a massless traceless symmetric second-rank tensor excitation of the closed string, identified with the graviton) in addition to gauge forces which arise from massless excitation of the open or closed string (depending on the perturbative formulation of the theory).

We feel the emergent gravity we have discussed so far is very parallel to string theory in many aspects. We may understand this wonderful similarity by noticing the following fact [5]. A Riemannian geometry is defined by a pair (M, g) where the metric g encodes all geometric informations while a symplectic geometry is defined by a pair (M, ω) where the 2-form ω encodes all. A basic concept in Riemannian geometry is a distance defined by the metric. One may identify this distance with a geodesic worldline of a “particle” moving in M . On the contrary, a basic concept in symplectic geometry is an area defined by the symplectic structure. One may regard this area as a minimal

worldsheet swept by a “string” moving in M . In this picture the wiggly string and so a fluctuating worldsheet may be interpreted as a deformation of the symplectic structure in spacetime M . But we know that a Riemannian geometry (or gravity) is emergent from wiggly strings or the deformation of the symplectic structure ! Amusingly, the Riemannian geometry is probed by particles while the symplectic geometry would be probed by strings.

Hence the emergent gravity we have reviewed in this paper may be deeply related to the string theory. It may be supported by the fact that many essential aspects of string theory, for example, AdS/CFT correspondence, open-closed string duality, noncommutative geometry, mirror symmetry, etc. have also been realized in the context of emergent noncommutative geometry. So we may moderately claim that string theory is simply a “stringy” realization of symplectic or Poisson spacetime.

There are many important issues that we didn’t even touch.

Although we have speculated that matter fields can emerge from stable localized geometries defined by noncommutative \star -algebra, we could not understand how particle masses can be generated from the noncommutative \star -algebra, in other words, how to realize the spontaneous electroweak symmetry breaking or the Higgs mechanism. We believe this problem could be deeply related to the question how the extra internal space F for weak and strong forces in Section 4 was dynamically compactified. We don’t know it yet except some vague ideas. From the background independent formulation of quantum gravity, the Standard Model is completely an unexplored territory. We don’t know yet what the Standard Model is from the emergent spacetime point of view.

How does supersymmetry arise from a background independent quantum gravity theory and what is the role of supersymmetry in the emergent geometry and emergent matters ? How to break it ? We have no idea about supersymmetry. But that issue should be understood in the near future.

Though we have tried to concretely formulate the emergent gravity as far as possible, a rigorous mathematical formulation of emergent gravity and especially background independent quantum gravity is highly demanded as ever. We think that Lie algebroid will be a very useful mathematical framework for emergent gravity. Here we will introduce the definition of Lie algebroid [66] to appreciate how much it sounds like a mathematical manifestation of emergent quantum gravity. A progress along this line will be published elsewhere.

A Lie algebroid is a triple $(E, [\cdot, \cdot], \rho)$ consisting of a smooth vector bundle E over a manifold M , together with a Lie algebra structure $[\cdot, \cdot]$ on the vector space $\Gamma(E)$ of the smooth global sections of E , and a morphism of vector bundles $\rho : E \rightarrow TM$, called the anchor, where TM is the tangent bundle of M . The anchor and the bracket are to satisfy the Leibniz rule such that

$$[X, fY] = f[X, Y] + (\rho(X)f) \cdot Y \quad (6.1)$$

for all $X, Y \in \Gamma(E)$ and $f \in C^\infty(M)$. Here $\rho(X)f$ is the derivative of f along the vector field $\rho(X)$. The anchor ρ defines a Lie algebra homomorphism from the Lie algebra of sections of E , with Lie bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]$, into the Lie algebra of vector fields on M , i.e.,

$$\rho([X, Y]) = [\rho(X), \rho(Y)]. \quad (6.2)$$

If M is a Poisson manifold, then the cotangent bundle $T^*M \rightarrow M$ is, in a natural way, a Lie algebroid over M . The anchor is the map $\pi^\sharp : T^*M \rightarrow TM$ defined by the Poisson bivector π . See Eq.(3.94). The Lie bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]$ of differential 1-forms satisfies $[df, dg] = d\{f, g\}_\pi$ for any functions $f, g \in C^\infty(M)$, where $\{f, g\}_\pi = \pi(df, dg)$ is the Poisson bracket defined by π . When π is nondegenerate, M is a symplectic manifold and this Lie algebra structure of $\Gamma(T^*M)$ is isomorphic to that of $\Gamma(TM)$. A noncommutative generalization, i.e. $\{f, g\}_\pi \rightarrow -i[\hat{f}, \hat{g}]_\star$, seems to be possible.

Because the background independent quantum gravity does not assume any kind of spacetime structure, a natural question is then why spacetime at large scales is four dimensions. If gravity is emergent from gauge field interactions, we may notice that electromagnetism is now only a long range force in Nature. Weak and strong forces are short range forces, so they will affect only microscopic structure of spacetime. Then we may infer that only the electromagnetism is responsible for the large scale structure of spacetime. In this regard, there is a funny coincidence [36]. If we compare the number of physical polarizations of photons and gravitons in D dimensions and find the matching condition of the physical polarizations, we get a cute number: $\mathfrak{X}(A_\mu) = D - 2 = \frac{D(D-3)}{2} = \mathfrak{X}(g_{\mu\nu}) \Rightarrow D = 1$ or $D = 4$, where \mathfrak{X} denotes the number of polarizations. Of course, we have to throw $D = 1$ away because it is not physically meaningful. Does this unfledged math have some meaning?

Acknowledgments

HSY thanks John J. Oh, Chanyong Park and M. Sivakumar for helpful discussions for some issues presented in this review. This work was partly done when HSY visited the KEK Theory Center using the International Visitor Program. He thanks Yoshihisa Kitazawa and Jun Nishimura for warm hospitality and helpful discussions during his visit and Koji Hashimoto for enlightening discussion at RIKEN theory seminar. The work of J.J. Lee was supported by the Korea Research Foundation Grant funded by the Korean Government (MOEHRD, Basic Research Promotion Fund) (KRF-2008-314-C00063) and the Topical Research Program (2010-T-01) of APCTP and the work of H.S. Yang was supported by the RP-Grant 2009 of Ewha Womans University.

References

- [1] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1973).
- [2] H. S. Yang, Europhys. Lett. **88** (2009) 31002, hep-th/0608013.
- [3] H. S. Yang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A24** (2009) 4473, hep-th/0611174.
- [4] H. S. Yang, Eur. Phys. J. **C64** (2009) 445, arXiv:0704.0929.
- [5] H. S. Yang, J. High Energy Phys. **05** (2009) 012, arXiv:0809.4728.
- [6] R. Abraham and J. E. Marsden, *Foundations of Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1978).
- [7] M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73** (2001) 977, hep-th/0106048; R. J. Szabo, Phys. Rep. **378** (2003) 207, hep-th/0109162.
- [8] R. J. Szabo, Class. Quantum Grav. **23** (2006) R199, hep-th/0606233.
- [9] K. Becker, M. Becker and J. Schwarz, *String Theory and M-Theory: A Modern Introduction* (Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 2007).
- [10] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, J. High Energy Phys. **09** (1999) 032, hep-th/9908142.
- [11] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry* (Academic Press, San Diego, CA, 1994).
- [12] M. Kontsevich, Lett. Math. Phys. **66** (2003) 157, q-alg/9709040.
- [13] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 5112, hep-th/9610043.
- [14] N. Ishibashi, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and A. Tsuchiya, Nucl. Phys. **B498** (1997) 467, hep-th/9612115; H. Aoki, S. Iso, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and T. Tada, Prog. Theor. Phys. **99** (1998) 713, hep-th/9802085; H. Aoki, N. Ishibashi, S. Iso, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and T. Tada, Nucl. Phys. **B565** (2000) 176, hep-th/9908141.
- [15] L. Motl, hep-th/9701025; R. Dijkgraaf, E. Verlinde and H. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. **B500** (1997) 43, hep-th/9703030.
- [16] W. Taylor, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73** (2001) 419, hep-th/0101126.
- [17] G. E. Volovik, *The Universe in a Helium Droplet*, (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2003); C. Barcelo, S. Liberati and M. Visser, Living Rev. Rel. **8** (2005) 12, gr-qc/0505065.

- [18] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 231, hep-th/9711200; S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **B428** (1998) 105, hep-th/9802109; E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 253, hep-th/9802150.
- [19] V. O. Rivelles, Phys. Lett. **B558** (2003) 191, hep-th/0212262.
- [20] H. S. Yang, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A21** (2006) 2637, hep-th/0402002; R. Banerjee and H. S. Yang, Nucl. Phys. **B708** (2005) 434, hep-th/0404064.
- [21] H. Steinacker, J. High Energy Phys. **12** (2007) 049, arXiv:0708.2426; H. Grosse, H. Steinacker and M. Wohlgenannt, *ibid.* **04** (2008) 023, arXiv:0802.0973; D. Klammer and H. Steinacker, *ibid.* **08** (2008) 074, arXiv:0805.1157; *ibid.* **02** (2010) 074, arXiv:0909.5298; H. Steinacker, Nucl. Phys. **B810** (2009) 1, arXiv:0806.2032; J. High Energy Phys. **02** (2009) 044, arXiv:0812.3761.
- [22] D. Klammer and H. Steinacker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 221301, arXiv:0903.0986.
- [23] H. Steinacker, J. High Energy Phys. **12** (2009) 024, arXiv:0909.4621; D. N. Blaschke and H. Steinacker, Class. Quant. Grav. **27** (2010) 165010, arXiv:1003.4132.
- [24] H. Steinacker, Class. Quant. Grav. **27** (2010) 133001, arXiv:1003.4134.
- [25] A. D. Sakharov, Sov. Phys. Dokl. **12** (1968) 1040; A. H. Chamseddine and A. Connes, Commun. Math. Phys. **186** (1997) 731, hep-th/9606001; A. H. Chamseddine, A. Connes and M. Marcolli, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **11** (2007) 991, hep-th/0610241.
- [26] J. Madore and J. Mourad, J. Math. Phys. **39** (1998) 423, gr-qc/9607060; S. I. Vacaru, Phys. Lett. **B498** (2001) 74, hep-th/0009163; E. Langmann and R. J. Szabo, Phys. Rev. **D64** (2001) 104019, hep-th/0105094; R. J. Szabo, Gen. Relativ. Grav. **42** (2010) 1, arXiv:0906.2913.
- [27] M. Burić, T. Grammatikopoulos, J. Madore and G. Zoupanos, J. High Energy Phys. **04** (2006) 054, hep-th/0603044; M. Burić, J. Madore and G. Zoupanos, SIGMA **3** (2007) 125, arXiv:0712.4024; M. Burić, H. Grosse and J. Madore, arXiv:1003.2284.
- [28] B. Muthukumar, Phys. Rev. **D71** (2005) 105007, hep-th/0412069; A. H. Fatollahi, Phys. Lett. **B665** (2008) 257, arXiv:0805.1159; A. Stern, Phys. Rev. **D80** (2009) 067703, arXiv:0907.4532, R. Banerjee, B. Chakraborty, S. Ghosh, P. Mukherjee and S. Samanta, Found. Phys. **39** (2009) 1297, arXiv:0909.1000.
- [29] H. Lin, O. Lunin and J. Maldacena, J. High Energy Phys. **10** (2004) 025, hep-th/0409174; H. Lin and J. Maldacena, Phys. Rev. **D74** (2006) 084014, hep-th/0509235.

- [30] D. Berenstein, J. High Energy Phys. **01** (2006) 125, hep-th/0507203; D. Berenstein and D. H. Correa, *ibid.* **08** (2006) 006, hep-th/0511104; D. Berenstein and R. Cotta, Phys. Rev. **D74** (2006) 026006, hep-th/0605220; D. Berenstein, M. Hanada and S. A. Hartnoll, J. High Energy Phys. **02** (2009) 010, arXiv:0805.4658.
- [31] S. Iso, Y. Kimura, K. Tanaka and K. Wakatsuki, Nucl. Phys. **B604** (2001) 121, hep-th/0101102; R. Delgadillo-Blando, D. O'Connor and B. Ydri, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008) 201601, arXiv:0712.3011; J. High Energy Phys. **05** (2009) 049, arXiv:0806.0558; M. Hanada, Y. Hyakutake, J. Nishimura and S. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 191602, arXiv:0811.3102; H. Aoki, J. Nishimura and Y. Susaki, J. High Energy Phys. **04** (2009) 055, arXiv:0810.5234; *ibid.* **09** (2009) 084, arXiv:0907.2107.
- [32] T. Ishii, G. Ishiki, S. Shimasaki and A. Tsuchiya, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 106001 (2008), arXiv:0807.2352; G. Ishiki, S.-W. Kim, J. Nishimura and A. Tsuchiya, J. High Energy Phys. **09** (2009) 029, arXiv:0907.1488.
- [33] T. Ohl and A. Schenkel, arXiv:0912.2252; A. Schenkel and C. F. Uhlemann, SIGMA **6** (2010) 061, arXiv:1003.3190.
- [34] M. Salizzoni, A. Torrielli and H. S. Yang, Phys. Lett. **B634** (2006) 427, hep-th/0510249; H. S. Yang and M. Salizzoni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 201602, hep-th/0512215.
- [35] H. S. Yang, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A22** (2007) 1119, hep-th/0612231.
- [36] H. S. Yang, Bulg. J. Phys. **35** (2008) 323, arXiv:0711.0234.
- [37] H. S. Yang, arXiv:0711.2797; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A23** (2008) 2181, arXiv:0803.3272; arXiv:0902.0035.
- [38] H. S. Yang and M. Sivakumar, Phys. Rev. **D82** (2010) 045004, arXiv:0908.2809.
- [39] M. Kontsevich, Homological Algebra of Mirror Symmetry, alg-geom/9411018.
- [40] G. Darboux, Sur le probl'eme de Pfaff, Bull. Sci. Math. **6** (1882) 14-36, 49-68.
- [41] J. Moser, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **120** (1965) 286.
- [42] F. J. Dyson, Am. J. Phys. **58** (1990) 209.
- [43] C. R. Lee, Phys. Lett. **A148** (1990) 146.
- [44] S. Tanimura, Ann. Phys. **220** (1992) 229, hep-th/9306066; J. F. Carinena, L. A. Ibort, G. Marmo and A. Stern, Phys. Rep. **263** (1995) 153, hep-th/9306066.

- [45] S. Sternberg, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **74** (1977) 5253.
- [46] M. Karoubi, *K-Theory: An Introduction* (Springer, Berlin, 1978).
- [47] R. Minasian and G. Moore, J. High Energy Phys. **11** (1997) 002, hep-th/9710230; P. Hořava, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**(1998) 1373, hep-th/9812135.
- [48] E. Witten, J. High Energy Phys. **12** (1998) 019, hep-th/9810188; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A16** (2001) 693, hep-th/0007175.
- [49] K. Olsen and R. J. Szabo, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **3** (1999) 889, hep-th/9907140; J. A. Harvey, Komaba Lectures on Noncommutative Solitons and D-Branes, hep-th/0102076.
- [50] M. F. Atiyah, R. Bott and A. Shapiro, Topology **3** (suppl. **1**) (1964) 3.
- [51] N. Hitchin, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. **54** (2003) 281, math.DG/0209099; M. Gualtieri, math.DG/0401221; math.DG/0703298; G. R. Cavalcanti, math.DG/0501406.
- [52] L. Cornalba, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **4** (2000) 271, hep-th/9909081.
- [53] S. W. Hawking, Phys. Lett. **60A** (1977) 81; T. Eguchi and A. J. Hanson, Phys. Lett. **74B** (1978) 249; G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Lett. **78B** (1978) 430
- [54] J. J. Oh, C. Park and H. S. Yang, Gravitational Instantons and Yang-Mills Instantons, unpublished note (to appear).
- [55] Y. Hashimoto, Y. Yasui, S. Miyagi and T. Ootsuka, J. Math. Phys. **38** (1997) 5833, hep-th/9610069; T. Ootsuka, S. Miyagi, Y. Yasui and S. Zeze, Class. Quant. Grav. **16** (1999) 1305, gr-qc/9809083.
- [56] A. Ashtekar, T. Jacobson and L. Smolin, Commun. Math. Phys. **115** (1988) 631; L. J. Mason and E. T. Newman, Commun. Math. Phys. **121** (1989) 659; S. Chakravarty, L. Mason and E. T. Newman, J. Math. Phys. **32** (1991) 1458; D. D. Joyce, Duke Math. J. **77** (1995) 519.
- [57] N. Nekrasov and A. Schwarz, Commun. Math. Phys. **198** (1998) 689, hep-th/9802068; K.-Y. Kim, B.-H. Lee, H. S. Yang, J. Korean Phys. Soc. **41** (2002) 290, hep-th/0003093; Phys. Lett. **B523** (2001) 357, hep-th/0109121.
- [58] F. Bayen, M. Flato, C. Fronsdal, A. Lichnerowicz and D. Sternheimer, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **111** (1978) 61; 111; B. V. Fedosov, J. Diff. Geom. **40** (1994) 213.
- [59] R. S. Ward, Class. Quantum Grav. **7** (1990) L217.
- [60] E. Corrigan, C. Devchand, D. B. Fairlie and J. Nuyts, Nucl. Phys. **B214** (1983) 452; R. S. Ward, Nucl. Phys. **B236** (1984) 381.

- [61] D. Bak, K. Lee and J.-H. Park, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 025021 (2002), hep-th/0204221.
- [62] H. Elvang and J. Polchinski, C. R. Physique **4** (2003) 405, hep-th/0209104.
- [63] A. Zee, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A23** (2008) 1295, arXiv:0805.2183.
- [64] L. Cornalba, J. High Energy Phys. **09** (2000) 017, hep-th/9912293; Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **4** (2002) 1259, hep-th/0006018; L. Cornalba and R. Schiappa, Commun. Math. Phys. **225** (2002) 33, hep-th/0101219.
- [65] Y. M. Cho and P. G. O. Freund, Phys. Rev. **D12** (1975) 1711.
- [66] I. Vaisman, *Lectures on the geometry of Poisson manifolds* (Birkhäuser, Basel, 1994).
- [67] A. Weinstein, J. Diff. Geom. **18** (1983) 523.
- [68] S. K. Wong, Nuovo Cimento **65A** (1970) 689.
- [69] V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg, *Symplectic Techniques in Physics* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984).
- [70] A. Weinstein, Lett. Math. Phys. **2** (1978) 417.
- [71] P. Hořava, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005) 016405, hep-th/0503006.
- [72] G. E. Volovik, Lect. Notes Phys. **718** (2007) 31, cond-mat/0601372; Fermi-point scenario of emergent gravity, arXiv:0709.1258.
- [73] H. Georgi, *Lie Algebras in Particle Physics: From Isospin to Unified Theories* (Advanced Book Program, 1999).
- [74] T. Padmanabhan, Gen. Rel. Grav. **40** (2008) 529, arXiv:0705.2533; AIP Conf. Proc. **939** (2007) 114, arXiv:0706.1654; Adv. Sci. Lett. **2** (2009) 174, arXiv:0807.2356.
- [75] S. Minwalla, M. Van Raamsdonk and N. Seiberg, J. High Energy Phys. **02** (2000) 020, hep-th/9912072.
- [76] A. Raychaudhuri, Relativistic Cosmology. I, Phys. Rev. **98** (1955) 1123.
- [77] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1973).
- [78] M. Blau and S. Theisen, Gen. Relativ. Grav. **41** (2009) 743.